

St. Mark's Library
THE
General Theological
Seminary



Chelsea Square · New York
Maryland Diocesan Library
· The Memorial Library
of the Reverend Edwin A. Dalrymple.
Whittingham Collection



EX LIBRIS
THE REV. LESLIE E. GOODWIN

8062



ECCLESIA ANGLICANA

A History of the Church of Christ in England
from the Earliest to the Present Times

BY THE REV.

ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A.

JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

*(Sometime Tyrwhitt Scholar, Crosse Scholar, Hebrew University Prizeman
Fry Scholar of S. John's College, Carnus and Scholefield Prizeman)
Rector of King's Stanley*

New York

THOMAS WHITTAKER

2 & 3 BIBLE HOUSE

MDCCCLXXXIX

2830

J441

191020

MARYLAND DIOCESAN
LIBRARY

TO
EDWARD TOWGOOD, Esq.,
OF SAWSTON, CAMBRIDGESHIRE,

THE AUTHOR

DEDICATES THIS BOOK,
AS A SMALL BUT SINCERE TOKEN OF AFFECTIONATE REGARD
FOR A VALUED FRIEND, AND FOR
A FAITHFUL AND DEVOTED CHURCHMAN.

PREFACE.

THIS work has been written chiefly with the view of meeting the wants of candidates for theological examinations at Cambridge and elsewhere. Those who have gone through such ordeals may remember feeling the lack of a concise account of the *whole* history of the English Church. Handy volumes there were, which treated the subject from the sectarian standpoint, and made the Reformation the birth-time of the Church, thus depriving her of three-quarters of her existence. The more appreciative authors, who admitted our claim to be one with the præ-Reformation body, had written too diffusely for the very practical purposes of an "examinee." The present author has endeavoured to include a remote horizon on a small canvas, without disparagement either to perspective or detail. He is unfeignedly conscious of his incapacity to do justice to the conception, but hopes that the present volume will, for a time at least, meet a long-acknowledged want.

A. C. J.

November, 1881.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
THE CHURCH OF THE CELTS	1

CHAPTER II.

CONVERSION OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS	20
--	----

CHAPTER III.

THE NATIONAL ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH	33
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

ANGLO-NORMAN PERIOD	66
-------------------------------	----

CHAPTER V.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY	94
----------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VI.

THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES	112
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

HENRY VIII.	136
---------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

HENRY VIII.— <i>continued</i>	163
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

EDWARD VI.	203
--------------------	-----

CHAPTER X.

MARY	PAGE 241
----------------	-------------

CHAPTER XI.

ELIZABETH	279
---------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII.

ELIZABETH— <i>continued</i>	324
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

JAMES I.	341
------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

CHARLES I.	362
--------------------	-----

CHAPTER XV.

THE INTERREGNUM	397
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

CHARLES II.	403
---------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

JAMES II. TO GEORGE I.	421
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE GEORGIAN PERIOD	451
-------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

THE CHURCH OF THE PRESENT DAY	473
---	-----

INDEX	487
-----------------	-----

ECCLESIA ANGLICANA.

CHAPTER I.

The Church of the Celts.

Its connection with the Church of England—Early testimony to its existence—Traditional accounts of its origin—Perhaps an offshoot of the Church of Gaul—The British martyrs in the tenth persecution—British delegates at the Church Councils—British heretics—The mission of Germanus—Palladius and Patrick in Ireland—The Welsh mission to Ireland—Irish and Welsh missions to Scotland—Decadence of the Church in “England”—Severance of Celts and Saxons—The subsequent missions from Scotland—Peculiarities of the Celtic Church—Disproportionate number of bishops—Numerous monasteries—Peculiarities in computation of Easter—In Baptism, the tonsure, and consecration of bishops.

REGARDED as a political institution, the Church of England begins its history in the seventh century, when, Saxon heathenism having everywhere succumbed before the preaching of missionaries, Christianity was made the legal religion of the island. The identity of the corporate body thereupon “established”—the Church of Theodore and Dunstan, of Anselm and Becket, of Chicheley and Wolsey—with the society which now bears the name “Church of England,” is a fact recognized by English law,¹ and assailed only by those who

Its connection with the Church of England.

¹ As, for instance, in such cases as that cited by Dean Hook from the proceedings in the Court of Queen's Bench: “A clergyman desired to establish his claim to certain marriage fees. He would have gained his suit if he could have proved that his predecessors in the time of Richard I. had received the payment, and failing in that proof he was nonsuited. The whole process depended upon the sameness of

misconstrue the purpose of the Reformation. It might, therefore, appear natural to begin a history of this Church with an account of the celebrated mission of 596, and to substantiate her pretensions to Apostolic lineage by explaining what were the credentials of Augustine. The truth is, however, that the Catholic faith, in its connection with these islands, has a history centuries older than its recognition by Saxon legislature, and the consequent so-called union of Church and State. Long before Augustine's time there existed in these islands a society which professed the orthodox faith, maintained the episcopal lineage, and by sending its representatives to the great Councils asserted its claim to be reckoned among the scions of the Catholic Church. Though not initiated by this native Church, the conversion of the Saxon invaders was successfully accomplished only by the co-operation of missionaries belonging thereto. The stream which connects us with the Apostolic fountain head is, in fact, two-headed. It can be traced inferentially through the channel of a Celtic episcopate—through Aidan and Columban,—or perspicuously through Augustine and Theodore and the bishops accredited by Rome. A history of our Church would, if on this ground alone, be incomplete without an account of Celtic Christianity.

Early testimony to its existence.

It is probable that before the end of the first century Britain had received a knowledge of the Christian faith, and concurrently the then universal Orders of ministry. Soldiers in the Roman legions

the Church before and after the Reformation."—*Lives of Archbishops*, vol. vi. p. 36. The student may be reminded that the now common theory which would confound the Church of England with the creations of Protestantism, and assign its "establishment" to some undetermined date in the reign of Henry, Edward, or Elizabeth, was unknown before the Georgian period, save to unskilful Roman controversialists. Its present prevalence only deserves attention as attesting the impotence of the most substantial historical facts when arrayed against a theological prejudice.

may have, even thus early, acted as missionaries. We may also find an evangelizing agency in that commercial intercourse between Britain and the Continent which received such rapid development in the first century. That an organized mission to Britain had been attempted is hardly probable, though, as will be shown below, tradition teems with legends of such enterprises. These legends are nevertheless valuable as proofs of the fact for which they profess to account—that a Christian Church existed in Britain shortly after the Apostolic age.

The more general proofs of this fact are the statements of noted ecclesiastical writers. Tertullian (fl. 200) speaks of “those British districts hitherto inaccessible to the Romans, but subjugated to Christ.”¹ Justin Martyr (d. cir. 166) testifies to the prevalence of Christianity in “every” country known to the Romans.² In the third century Origen states plainly that “the power of God the Saviour is even with those who live in Britain and are separated from our world.” He asks, “When did Britain before the arrival of Christ assent to the religious belief in One God? But now, by reason of the Churches which occupy the ends of the world, the whole earth shouts with joy to the God of Israel.”³ In the time of Eusebius (d. cir. 340) the conversion of Britain in the Apostolic age appears to have been an accepted fact:—“That some (of the Apostles) should reach the extremities of the inhabited world, and that others should cross the ocean to the isles called Britannic, I no longer think to be the work of a mere man.”⁴ To the same effect writes Hilary (fl. 354)

¹ Adv. Judæos, c. 7.

² Cum Tryphone Dial., p. 388. Ed. Thirlby, Lond.

³ Hom. VI. in Lucam., p. 939, iii. (Paris, 1740); and Hom. in Ezek. p. 370.

⁴ Euseb., Dem. Evang., lib. iii. c. 7, p. 112.

Traditional
accounts of
its origin.

There arose in later years a desire to trace British Christianity to its very fountain head, and if possible connect it with names eminent in Christian history. This is a sufficient explanation of the more detailed accounts of missionary work in Britain preserved in legends. Few of these legends can be traced further back than the sixth century. Missions to Britain have been attributed—

(I.) To S. Paul himself, who is supposed to have visited Spain and the British Islands in the interval between his two imprisonments at Rome. It is urged that Clemens Romanus affirms that S. Paul “taught righteousness throughout the whole world, having travelled to the utmost bounds of the West.”¹ The testimony of Clemens, S. Paul’s personal friend, is doubtless weighty, but it is not plain that Britain is the region meant. There is, on the contrary, reason to believe that τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως means Spain. Nor is the statement of Theodoret (d. 458), that S. Paul “brought salvation to the islands lying in the ocean”² quite perspicuous. In fact, the theory that S. Paul was the Apostle of Britain, though countenanced by Usher and Stillingfleet, is now regarded as destitute of substantial foundation.

(II.) To other Apostles or persons mentioned in the New Testament. We have shown above how Eusebius attests the work of the Apostles in the British Islands. Later writers pretend to speak less vaguely on the subject, giving the names of these Apostolic missionaries. Besides S. Paul, the names of S. Peter, S. James the Great, and S. Simon Zelotes are recorded.³ There

¹ Clem. Rom. ad Cor., c. 5.

² In Psalm cxvi., tom. I. p. 871.

³ Stillingfleet, Orig. Britannicæ, vol. i.; and cf. Usher, De Primord., cap. I. pp. 5-7, cap. ii. p. 12.

is also a once popular legend concerning the mission of Joseph of Arimathea,¹ who is said to have come over from Gaul at S. Philip's bidding, bringing with him the Holy Grail, and to have settled with twelve companions at Glastonbury, then called Avalon. At the Council of Basle and other fifteenth-century Councils, where the question of precedence was keenly discussed between the representatives of the French and English Churches, this story was accepted as proof of the greater antiquity of the latter. The Glastonbury legends, however, are not older than the eleventh century, and the mission of Joseph is doubtless a mere fable. The Welsh Triads connect the Church of Britain with Aristobulus, whose household is saluted by S. Paul in Rom. xvi., and who is supposed to have been one of the seventy disciples of the Saviour. Caradoc or Caractacus is said to have returned from Rome with Aristobulus in the character of a bishop. Other New Testament names are introduced in this legend: the Pudens and Claudia of Martial (lib. iv. epigr. 13) are the friends whom S. Paul mentions (2 Tim. iv. 21), and are also the son-in-law and daughter of Caradoc. The legend is not altogether worthless, since modern commentators have admitted that the British lady Claudia, whose marriage with Pudens Martial celebrates, may really be the Claudia mentioned in conjunction with Pudens by S. Paul.²

(III.) To the missionaries sent by Eleutherius Bishop of Rome (176-190) to the court of Lucius a British king. The simplest form of this legend is in a sixth-century catalogue of Roman bishops. To the name Eleutherius is attached an interpolation that he "received a letter

¹ Stillingfleet, *Orig. Brit.*, vol. i. pp. 37-39. Oxf. 1842

² Alford, *Commentary*, vol. iii., Proleg. p. 104.

from Lucius, King of Britain, asking that he would order steps to be taken for making him a Christian." This short account is enlarged by Bede, and again by the Book of Llandaff (of the eleventh or twelfth century), and the Welsh Triads. According to its most embellished form Lucius, or Lleufer Mawr, sends two ambassadors, named Elfan and Medwy, to Pope Eleutherius, desiring instruction in the Christian faith. Efan and Dyvan, two most holy men, are deputed to the work; the king and his people are baptized, the heathen temples re-dedicated, and an episcopate is established, with archbishoprics at London, York, and Caerleon-on-Usk.

Perhaps an
evidence of
the Church
of Gaul.

Without denying altogether the operation of other and earlier missionary agencies, it is reasonable to suppose that, as regards Orders and organization at least, the British Church owed much to the Church of Gaul. At Lyons and Vienne Christian Churches were flourishing as early as A.D. 150. The subsequent relations of the British to the Gallican Church suggest that the former looked upon the latter as the mother Church. "Under the influence of this connection it was but natural that the British Church should follow the judgment of that of Gaul, (i.) in condemning the Donatists at the Council of Arles: (ii.) in fully approving, although with a temporary hesitation about the orthodoxy of the term *ὁμοούσιος*, of the Nicene condemnation of Arianism: and (iii.) in adopting for the observance of Easter the eighty-four years' cycle of Sulpicius Severus. To the influence of their mutual affection . . . should be attributed the great intercourse between the Gallican and British Churches in the fourth and fifth centuries. S. Martin of Tours, S. Germanus, S. Lupus, S. Severus are some of the Gallican bishops whose sympathy and active

assistance never failed the Church in Britain. Churches dedicated in their names indicate the honour in which British Christians filially treasured up their memory.”¹

With the dawn of the fourth century British Christianity passes from the region of conjecture and doubtful legend to that of history. There is no reason to doubt that in the great persecution of 303 Britain was the scene of martyrdoms. It is true that Lactantius writes that in these Western provinces the leniency of Constantius considerably abated the violence of the attack. In those regions, he says, Constantius only so far carried out the commands of his superiors that though the churches—the perishable walls of Christianity—were frequently demolished, “that true temple of God which is in the human body he preserved in safety.”² This testimony, however, does not preclude occasional outbreaks of violence against the persons of Christians, especially such as were serving in the Roman legions. What Gildas, the sixth-century historian, records with reference to the martyrdoms of Alban at Verulamium, Aaron and Julius at Caerleon-on-Usk, “and others of both sexes at divers places,”³ is therefore not incredible. In Bede the legend is so encumbered with supernatural accretions that it is difficult to distinguish fiction and fact.⁴ Alban, a pagan, shelters a fugitive Christian cleric, is converted, and surrenders himself to suffer in the stead of his guest. The stream divides that he may pass through it to the place of martyrdom; a fountain gushes from the ground in answer to his last prayer. Such was the form of the story in the eighth century. In

The British martyrs in the tenth persecution.

¹ John Pryce, *Ancient British Church*, pp. 59, 60—a work to which we are indebted for much valuable information, and which we recommend to such students as desire a lively but sufficiently exhaustive treatment of an interesting subject.

² Lactantius, *De Mort. Persec.*, xv., xvi.

³ *Hist.* viii. (M. H. B. 8).

⁴ Bæda, *Eccl. Hist.*, i. 18.

the later historians it appears with additional miraculous embellishments. In Britain, as elsewhere, the persecution must have ceased with the death of Diocletian in 305. Soon the conversion and military successes of Constantine had secured for all branches of the Church external peace, and the age of persecution gave place to the age of controversy and Œcumenical Councils.

British
delegates
at the
Church
Councils.

British Christianity now more plainly asserts itself. At the Council of Arles (314), where the dispute was settled between Cæcilian of Carthage and the schismatic Donatists, British bishops attended and affixed their signatures. According to the Corbey manuscript (to which Haddon and Stubbs give the preference), five British ecclesiastics were present¹—three bishops, a priest, and a deacon. York, London, and Caerleon appear to have been the sees of the episcopal representatives. The language of Athanasius seems to indicate that British bishops were personally present at the great Council of Nicæa (325). In the existent list of subscriptions their names do not appear. There is, however, reason to believe that this list is defective. So too, in the case of the Council of Sardica (347), which acquitted Athanasius, and which gave the Roman bishop the special power of ordering courts of appeal for rehearing causes, it is not plain whether the British episcopate was personally represented or only expressed subsequent concurrence. At Ariminum (359) a large number of British bishops were present, and with the other representatives, were persuaded to accept the plausible creed of the semi-Arians, which avoided the term *ὁμοούσιος*.² But that throughout the controversy the British Church was on the side of the orthodox party is sufficiently

¹ Haddon and Stubbs, *Councils*, 7.

² Cf. *Apolog. Contra Arianos*; Migne, *Series Græca*, tom. xxv. col. 249.

plain from the words of Athanasius. Its attitude in this great conflict elicited also the encomiums of Hilary, who congratulates "his co-bishops of Germany . . . and of the British provinces that they stood firmly, uncontaminated and uninjured by all the contagion of the detestable heresy."¹

To the seductions of another "detestable heresy" the British Church was more amenable. Pelagianism was a system which explained the paradox of man's free will and God's predestination in such a way as apparently to repudiate the doctrine of original sin. The Pelagians, if their antagonists do not misrepresent them, taught that the sin of Adam affected him only, and not all mankind; that man can of his own free will choose good as well as evil, and so secure a certain degree of future happiness apart from Christianity; that the divine grace of which Christianity tells is communicated by the influence of Christ's teaching and example; that the first beginning of renewal lies with the man himself, and that predestination is merely God's foreknowledge of human actions. Pelagius was a Briton of great personal holiness; his active disciple, Celestius, appears to have been an Irishman.² Pelagianism was condemned at Councils held at Carthage, 412; Ephesus, 431; and Orange, 529.

Though its two authors contracted their peculiar opinions abroad—perhaps from Ruffinus at Rome—yet it was in Britain that Pelagianism found widest acceptance. Its prevalence was the cause of the mission of S. Germanus. His biographer, Constantius, relates³ that the British ecclesiastics, perplexed by the spread

British
heretics.

The mis-
sion of
Germanus.

¹ Hilary, *De Synodis*, Proleg. et § 2.

² Augustin, *Epist.* 186, cap. 1.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. iv. p. 313.

³ *Vita S. Germani*, lib. i. cap. v.

of Pelagianism, invited the assistance of learned Gallican divines, and that a synod deputed Germanus Bishop of Auxerre and Lupus Bishop of Troyes to cross over to Britain. According to another account,¹ it was Pope Coelestine who authorized the mission of Germanus. The Gallican ecclesiastics landed in Britain in 429. They proceeded to preach, not only in churches, but throughout the open country, and were successful in reclaiming those who had been led astray. The Pelagian teachers ventured to face them in a public disputation, only to be confuted shamefully. Germanus did not quit this land before he had attained a triumph with more carnal weapons. The Picts attempted to beset a Christian congregation who were celebrating Easter in the Vale of Mold, in Flintshire. Germanus succeeded in striking the enemy with panic by setting a corps in ambush, who, at a given signal, charged with cries of "Hallelujah!" This event is known as the Hallelujah victory. Germanus is said to have paid Britain a second visit in 447, with Severus, Archbishop of Treves. A doubtful legend ascribes to him the monastic institutions at Llancarvan and Llanilltyd, and relates that he appointed Illtud to be the head, and Lupus to be the bishop, of the latter college. Remembering that it was lack of theological learning in the British ecclesiastics which necessitated his visits, we may think it possible that he suggested the establishment of such seminaries, though Llancarvan and Llanilltyd were probably founded at a later date. An ancient manuscript records that Germanus introduced into Britain the "*ordinem cursus Gallorum*," which we may perhaps identify with that Gallican liturgy which Augustine found in use in the British Church.

¹ Prosper Aquitanus, Chron. sub anno 433.

How extensive was the influence of Germanus in the west of the island is attested by the still surviving churches dedicated to the Gallican missionary at S. Harmon, Bettws Garmon, and the several Llanarmons. Pelagianism was probably quite exterminated by Germanus. The tradition which records its subsequent condemnation at the synods of Llanddewi-Brefi and Lucus Victoriæ in the middle of the sixth century is of no value, though the synods themselves may be regarded as historical.

The mission of Patrick to Ireland was contemporaneous with that of Germanus to Britain. In the legend which makes Pope Coelestine authorize the journey of Germanus there is possibly a confusion of the two incidents. Christianity appears to have been planted early in the sister island, but hitherto had borne little fruit. Jerome, at the end of the fourth century, describes the contemporary Irish as idolaters, who fed on human flesh and acknowledged no restraint in sexual intercourse. To this unpromising field of labour Coelestine sent a monk of Brittany, named Palladius,¹ as a missionary bishop, much in the same way as Gregory, a century later, sent Augustine to Britain. Palladius, it is said, built some churches in Wicklow, but failed to win many converts. Sailing round the coast northward, he was driven by a storm to the Scotch coast. His subsequent fate is uncertain. Patrick undertook the mission which had thus proved abortive, cir. 430, and his success was testified to by an Irish proverb, "Not to Palladius but to Patrick."²

Palladius
and
Patrick in
Ireland.

¹ Prosper. Chron. ad Ann. 455: "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes . . . primus episcopus mittitur." This probably implies that some Christianity had survived in Ireland. But it is obvious from the sequel that Palladius was really sent as a missionary rather than an overseer.

² Sexta, Vit. S. Patricii ap. Colgan, Trias Thaum. 70.

Again the name of Coelestine is introduced. We are told that the missionary's baptismal name was Suchar, and that he was a Breton, the son of Calphurnius and Conche, S. Martin's sister. Educated by S. Martin and Germanus of Auxerre, he was deputed by Coelestine to act as "Archiepiscopus Scotorum," under the new title Patricius. The accounts of Patrick's missionary labours are full of miracles. It appears credible that he did much, in conjunction with a corps of British monks, to exterminate idolatry. That he established an ecclesiastical organization, instituted canons, and made Armagh the metropolitan city of several bishoprics, may perhaps be only a flattering legend.

The Welsh
mission
to Ireland.

At all events the work of Patrick was not destined to survive. The traditionary date of the missionary's death is 493. Before 550 the Christianity of Ireland had so suffered from apostacy that "all, from the highest to the lowest, had cast aside the Catholic faith,"¹ and the saints of Wales were implored to undertake the third mission to Ireland. Making allowance for the partiality of the British annalists and biographers, we may yet believe that no light duties were demanded of Gildas and his fellow labourers, and that the subsequent prosperity of the Irish Church was due to their exertions. Certain it is that henceforward Ireland was noted as a great centre of Christian culture and missionary enterprise.

Irish and
Welsh mis-
sions to
Scotland.

What David, Cadoc, and Gildas had done for Ireland the next generation of West British saints did for Southern Scotland. The Irish mission of Columban, entering Scotland from the west, fell in with the representatives of the older Church,—the Welsh missionary band, headed first by Ninian, then by Kentigern.

¹ Vita S. Gildæ, xi., xii.; Mabill, Actt. SS. Benedict., i. 138.

The two parties laboured among the Picts in harmony and frequent interchange of good offices. On the island of Hy, or Iona, which was given him by one of the native chieftains, Columban established a monastic college, which became an important missionary station. A cathedral church of white stone, dedicated to S. Martin, gave to the promontory in Galloway the name Whithern. In at least sixty-three districts, according to Bishop Forbes,¹ the nomenclature of churches attests the popularity of the Welsh missionary. It will be shown in the next chapter what an important influence these Christian stations in the north were destined to exercise on the history of our Church.

Such is the account of Christianity in West Britain in the sixth century. Its external activity was making the sister island a veritable *insula sanctorum*, and establishing the Christian religion among the savage Picts of Scotland. Its internal prosperity was attested by the rise of monasteries and educational seminaries, and by the substitution of parochial churches for the earlier preaching stations.

Decadence
of the
Church in
"England."

Very different was the state of that part of the island which we now distinguish as England. From the middle of the fifth century there had swept upon the eastern coast continuous waves of invasion. Year after year had witnessed the advance of Saxons, Angles, and Jutes towards the heart of Britain, and where these barbarous hordes had settled every trace of Christianity was effaced. The natives, incapacitated for resistance by disunion, were slaughtered by thousands on the field of battle. The survivors pressed farther and farther westward, till safety was at last attained in the mountain fastnesses and tangled forests of Wales and Devon-

¹ Kalendars of Scottish Saints, p. 424.

shire, where the pagans dared not penetrate. In this western region, therefore, was all that remained of British Christianity. Elsewhere the worship of Thor and Odin had utterly exterminated the religion of Christ. "The cities went to ruins: Christianity became extinct, and all culture with it. There were still Roman roads leading to the walls and towers of empty cities; the Roman divisions of the land were conspicuous; the intrenched and fortified camps; the great villas of the princely families; churches and burial-places: but they were become before the days of Bede mere haunted ruins, something like the mysterious fabrics which in Central America tell of the rule of a mighty race whose name is forgotten."¹ This effacement of Christianity may be considered to have been completed in 586, when the last surviving bishops, Theonas of London and Thadiocus of York, are said to have joined their fugitive compatriots in their western asylum.

Severance
of Celts and
Saxons.

That we have no record of attempts to convert these savage tribes on the part of the vanquished Britons scarcely requires comment. Mutual animosity, engendered by years of bloody conflict, is scarcely conducive to the propagation of the gospel of peace. In later times, when the hard tempers of the northern freebooters had encountered the gracious influences of Christianity, the converts of Augustine and Aidan maintained towards their British brethren all the hatred of the wrongdoer to his victims. The boundary line which divided the two races was Offa's Dyke. In the eighth century, the Welshman who crossed this boundary was liable to mutilation. Laws almost as barbarous were passed by subsequent generations of

¹ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, vol. i. p. 61.

Saxon princes. That there was a correspondent ill will on the part of the vanquished race is more than probable. There may be a substratum of authenticity in the reply which the Abbot of Bangor is represented as making to Augustine: "No, we will not preach the faith to the cruel race of strangers who have treacherously driven our ancestors from their country and robbed their posterity of their heritage."¹

It will be shown in the next chapter that the conversion of Saxon England was effected by native Christians as much as by foreign missionaries. But these representatives of Celtic Christianity did not come from West Britain, but from Scotland. It was not directly from the parent stem, but from its scion—from those Northern settlements which through Columban no less than through Ninian, can be traced back to the saints of Wales—that the English Christianity of the seventh century derived life and vigour.

The subsequent missions from Scotland.

We close this chapter with an account of the most striking features in the organization and discipline of the native Church. We premise that the close relationship of Irish and North British Christianity to the Christianity of West Britain had effected a general uniformity in such matters in the seventh century, and that "outside the Roman and Augustinian circle of ideas there was substantially throughout Britain perfect uniformity on all points relating to divine worship and ecclesiastical discipline."²

Peculiarities of the Celtic Church.

One notable feature in the British system is the seemingly disproportionate size of the episcopate. The diocesan system was very imperfect at this time: there is reason to believe that when the Romans quitted Britain Caerleon was the only see in Wales. Yet, barely

Disproportionate number of bishops.

¹ Brut. Tysilio in Myfyr. Archæology vol. ii. 365.

² Pryce, Ancient British Church.

a century later, 119 bishops attended the synod of Llanddewi-Brefi, and a century earlier the language of Athanasius and Hilary suggests that the number of British bishops at the time of the Arian controversy was disproportionately large. The existence of an order of monastic bishops explains the apparent anomaly. Both in Ireland and Wales a resident bishop appears to have been considered essential to the right governing of a monastery. Sometimes such bishops were abbots; usually, however, they were subordinate members of the religious house, exercising no other functions but those connected with the transmission of the priestly office. In some cases bishops lived together in colleges, which were probably centres of missionary enterprise. Many such episcopal *cænobia* of seven members are enumerated in Ireland, and in Wales an establishment of seven bishops is associated with the name of S. David.

NUMEROUS
BISHOPS
series.

Next to this extension of the episcopal order, and as a consequence of it, we are called upon to notice the development of the monastic system. Wales and Ireland were both covered with a network of religious houses, and the constant ebb and flow of missionaries between Wales, Cornwall, Ireland, and North Britain finds explanation in this prevalent monasticism, involving as it did celibacy and freedom from domestic ties. To what an extent monasticism was sometimes developed we gather from the account of Bangor Iscoed, the great establishment on the Dee. This monastery attained the proportions of a modern university. It was divided into seven parts, and each part contained no fewer than seven hundred men. It may be no exaggeration that when the praying monks of Bangor were put to the sword by Æthelfrith the Northumbrian, there were twelve hundred victims.

It will be shown in the next chapter that the native Church had certain peculiarities of usage which they were unwilling to adapt to the Roman system advocated by Augustine. We here notice the most conspicuous points of difference.

(I.) The time for the observance of Easter.

This deviation from Roman usage was really the relic of an earlier controversy of considerable importance. The original ground of dispute was that the Christians of Asia Minor commemorated the Saviour's death and Resurrection contemporaneously with the Jewish Passover: *i.e.* the three sacred days began with the fourteenth moon of the first lunation after the spring equinox, without reference to the day of the week. They were on this account called *quarto-decimani*. The Western Churches, on the other hand, followed by the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, observed Good Friday on this fourteenth day of "Nisan," if it fell on a Friday; if not, on the next Friday. The following Sunday was their Easter Day. The Church of Rome was particularly hostile to the *quarto-deciman* practice, and Pope Victor (cir. 200) went the length of excommunicating the Asiatic Churches. At the Councils of Arles and Nicæa the Western usage gained the day. It was ruled that Easter Day should always be a Sunday, and this Sunday was to be that which followed the first full moon which fell on or after the vernal equinox. Even now conformity was not established. The new source of discord was the reformed calendar, based on the discovery of the Metonic cycle of nineteen years. The new system of computation was adopted by the Church of Alexandria, but the Roman Church until 525 clung to the Jewish calendar with its cycle of eighty-four

Peculiarities in computation of Easter.

years. In the years 475, 495, 496, 499, and 516, Easter Day was consequently eight days later in the West than in the East. The peculiarity of the British Christians was not¹ connected with the *quarto-deciman* practice, but with a retention of the eighty-four years cycle. Isolated from the Continent when the Western Churches accepted the reformed calendar, they had continued to compute Easter as Rome had computed it until 525. A minor peculiarity existed, it seems, in their placing the equinox on the 25th of March. But the ancient *quarto-deciman* use does not bear directly on the question, save so far as it interprets the unfair insinuation of some Saxon writers, that the British Christians were "Judaic" in their observance of Easter.

In Baptism. (II.) The administration of Baptism. Augustine, at the last conference with the British bishops, made the demand "*ut ministerium baptizandi . . . juxta morem sanctæ Romanæ et Apostolicæ ecclesiæ compleatis.*"² It is not known to what peculiarity in the British office this requisition points. That the Britons neglected either the chrism or Confirmation is not probable, for both were in use in the kindred Irish body. Some suppose that the trine immersion customary elsewhere had not been a part of the British ritual. Dr. Lingard, explaining the *complementum baptismi* as confirmation, suggests that Augustine desired conformity with the Roman rule that persons baptized on the eves of the greater festivals should be at once brought before the bishop for Confirmation.³

The tonsure. (III.) The tonsure. "The British Church, differing both from the Greek and the Roman, shaved the head in an imperfect manner, 'ab aure ad aurem,' across the

¹ See Bæda, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 17, and iii. 3, 25, 28; and v. 21.

² Anglo-Saxon Church, vol. i. p. 69, n.

³ *Ibid.*, ii. 2.

front of the head, but leaving the occiput untouched.”¹ The Greek or Pauline tonsure included the whole head; the Roman or Petrine use was to shave the crown, leaving a circle of hair, which was supposed to represent the crown of thorns. The tonsure was one of the burning questions which were discussed at the Council of Whitby.

(IV.) The consecration of bishops. In the Celtic Churches a single bishop was considered sufficient to perform the act of consecration.² And conse-
cration of
bishops.

At the Council of Whitby papal authority was held to be sufficient to set aside local usage. The Roman Easter was accepted in North Wales in 760, at the instance of Elfod, Bishop of Bangor; in South Wales the continued divergence of custom provoked an English invasion about this time. A bishop named Cyfelach was slain, but victory rested with the Welsh. A few years later, South Wales accepted the Roman use.

¹ Pryce, *Ancient British Church*, p. 208.

² *Vita S. Kentigern* in Pinkerton, *Vitæ SS. Scot.*, p. 223.

CHAPTER II.

Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons.

A.D. 596-664.

Gregory proposes to convert England—Mission of Augustine—Its success in Kent—Gregory's extensive plan of organization—How is Augustine to deal with the Celtic Church?—Gregory's instructions—Conference with its representatives—Augustine's ultimatum—The rupture—Augustine's work overrated—Kent and Essex relapse—Temporary success of Paulinus in Northumbria—Intervention of missionaries from Scotland—Collision between the two systems—Council of Whitby.

Gregory
proposes to
convert
England.

At the end of the sixth century the Teuton hordes had secured almost all England south of the Tweed and east of the Dee and Severn. Civilized only in their elaborate constitutional organization, the subjects of the Heptarchy showed their peculiarly brutal instincts in their religion. Their god Woden was propitiated by human sacrifices. Unhallowed love was typified by the deity Freyr. Their Valhalla was an intensity of debauchery and bloodshed. Traffic in slaves was pushed by these Anglo-Saxons to an extent unknown among other nations, for it was their common practice to sell their compatriots, and even their nearest relations, to the continental merchants. Indirectly this inhuman usage is connected with the first recorded mission to Anglo-Saxon England. Some fair-haired Yorkshire lads in the Roman slave-market attracted the notice of Gregory, the ascetic founder and abbot of S. Andrew's Monastery on Mount Cælius. The dialogue that ensued was seasoned by Gregory with

comments of characteristic humour. "These Angles," he said, "must become angels; their province Deira must be rescued *de ira Dei*; their king Ella shall have Alleluia sung in his dominions."¹ The purpose thus quaintly expressed took deep root in his mind, and was put in execution some years afterwards, when the Abbot of S. Andrew's was known to all Christendom as Pope Gregory the Great. Before this, he had himself set out on a mission to the western islands, but was forced to return, in obedience to Pope Benedict's peremptory summons, ere he had gone three days' journey.² As Pope, at a time when he was harassed by the combined anxieties of a famine, a schism, and a threatened invasion, Gregory could spare sympathy for the Anglo-Saxon heathens. A mission was entrusted to his own establishment on Mount Cælius. Its prior, Augustine, a tall swarthy monk, whose somewhat arrogant demeanour was not condoned by talents of any importance, becomes henceforth the central figure in the story. Augustine's missionary band consisted of forty monks, lay and cleric. With these he journeyed into Gaul, intending to take ship thence for England.

The mission was altogether devoid of that enthusiastic zeal which animated its author. Tales were told in southern Gaul of the ferocity and barbarous practices of the English:³ these soon brought Augustine back to Rome with a prayer that the enterprise might be abandoned. This Gregory would not hear of. By letters to the Frankish princes and prelates he secured for Augustine's mission protection on its journey through Gaul, and a sufficient contingent of ambassadors and

Mission of
Augustine.
A.D. 596.

¹ Bæda, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 2.

² Joan. Dlac., *Vita S. Gregor.*, lib. i. 22, 23.

³ Gotselinus, *Hist. Maj.*, i. 6.

CHAP.
II.

interpreters to facilitate its work in England. So aided, the missionaries reached the coast of Kent, landing on the very spot which had witnessed the arrival of the race they came to evangelize.

Its success
in Kent.

The King of Kent was the powerful Ethelbert. His wife was Bertha, daughter of Charibert King of the Franks of Paris, and a Christian—a circumstance which augured well for the success of the mission. It had been stipulated that she should be allowed the free exercise of her religion, and Luidhard, Bishop of Senlis, had been sent with her to England. The mission had, in fact, lighted on the one spot of Saxon England where Christianity was known and tolerated. Ethelbert appointed a day for an interview with his visitors, who were to meet him in the open air that he might not be duped by elaborate magical contrivances. At the time appointed the missionaries appeared before the king in a solemn religious procession. Before Augustine was carried a cross; after him a picture of our Saviour painted on a board; the brethren who followed sang to the lately revived Gregorian chants a litany for the salvation of their heathen hearers. To the interpreters who communicated Augustine's discourse Ethelbert gave an attentive hearing. The perilous enterprise was regarded as a proof of sincere purpose. The missionaries received a gracious reply, tempered with politic caution; they were allowed to reside at Canterbury, and the old Church of S. Martin's still marks the spot where stood the edifice assigned for their use.¹ To their preaching, their ascetic manner of life, and their reputed miracles Bede attributes their subsequent successes. On Whit-Sunday, 597, Ethelbert was baptized; his wise men soon shared his convictions

¹ See Bæda, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 21; Gotselinus, *Hist. Maj.*, ii. 15-19.

or obeyed his bidding. A decree was issued ordering a recognition of Christianity, and 10,000¹ Kentish subjects were baptized at Christmas opposite the Isle of Sheppy.

CHAP.
II.

Augustine communicated to head-quarters the success of the mission, and Gregory's instructions took him to Arles, where he was consecrated by Virgilius as Archbishop of the English. The metropolitan church was to be built at Canterbury, the capital of his royal convert. Twelve bishoprics were to be founded in the south of England. Twelve more were to form a northern province. There was to be a metropolitan see at York, but it was to be subject to Augustine's supremacy.² While such was the programme, the range of this Roman mission really extended to only one province besides Kent. In Essex Sebert nephew to Ethelbert had been converted. Here Mellitus, one of a second contingent of missionaries despatched by Gregory, was consecrated Bishop of London. Kent also now received a suffragan bishopric at Rochester, which was placed under the superintendence of Justus, who had accompanied Mellitus. At the court of Ethelbert his friend Redwald, King of East Anglia, was converted to Christianity and baptized. But East Anglia can hardly be reckoned among the provinces won by Gregory's mission. On returning home, Redwald was persuaded by his wife and the pagan priests to combine the worship of Christ with that of the national deities. No East Anglian bishopric was founded.

Gregory's
extensive
plan of
organization.

In Augustine's letters to Gregory instructions are demanded with respect to his future relations with the

How is
Augustine
to deal with

¹ Bæda, Hist. Eccl., i. 26; S. Gregor., Epist. VIII., 30.

² S. Gregor., Epist. XI., 65.

CHAP.

II.

the Celtic
Church?
Gregory's
instruc-
tions.

native Church. A naïve perplexity, as of one who knew no form of Christianity but that taught in the Roman monasteries, characterizes these questions. "Whereas there is but one faith, why are there different customs in different Churches, and why is one custom of masses observed in the holy Roman Church, and another in the Gallican Church? . . . How are we to deal with the bishops of France and Britain?" In criticising Gregory's reply, we must take into consideration the ideas of Roman supremacy generally accepted in the sixth century. Since the Council of Sardica, which had given the Roman bishop the right of deciding whether a conciliar judgment should be reconsidered, Rome had been gradually establishing herself as the centre of Christendom, claiming from the other episcopates—of the West, at all events—an undefined allegiance. Various causes had combined to secure to Rome this supremacy; not least effective had been the personal characteristics of certain Popes,—the brilliant pontificates of Innocent, Leo, and Gregory himself. Writing doubtless in ignorance of the deep-rooted animosity which divided Briton and Saxon, Gregory ordered that the new archiepiscopate in Ethelbert's dominions should control not only all bishops ordained by Augustine, or by the future Archbishop of York, "but also all the priests of Britain." "Over the bishops of France," writes Gregory, "we give you no authority, because the Bishop of Arles received the pall in ancient times from my predecessor, and we ought by no means to deprive him of the authority he has received; but as to all the Bishops of Britain, we commit them to your care, that the unlearned may be taught, the feeble strengthened by persuasion, and the perverse corrected by authority."

The papal solution of the problem of nonconformity in ritual is less open to censure than this encroachment on national independence. It breathes a spirit of wisdom and toleration. "If you have found anything either in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be pleasing to Almighty God, select it carefully and sedulously; teach the Anglican Church, which as yet is new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose therefore from every Church those things that are pious, religious, and upright."¹

Already the new metropolitan had received from Gregory a pall, the token that he ruled as the delegate of the Papacy. That such was, even thus early, the significance of the pall appears undeniable. In later times it was pretended that the office of metropolitan was unattainable without it, and this assumption was finally embodied in a decree by the Lateran Council of 1215. The form of the vestment was then somewhat like that of the pall in the archiepiscopal arms of Canterbury—a circular mantle with long pendants. But the pallium sent by Gregory appears to have been a robe of state, such as the emperors had been wont to confer on provincial governors.

To the British Christians Augustine's assumption of metropolitan powers must have been as unintelligible as offensive. For one hundred and fifty years the Church in Britain had kept the faith unaided by Popes or papal delegates. Rome it knew not, but Saxon princes, Rome's present allies, it knew and hated. Plainly no ordinary measure of meekness, humility,

Conference
with its
representa-
tives.

¹ Bæda, Hist. Eccl., i. 27; S. Gregor., Epist. XI., 64.

CHAP.

II.

A.D. 597:

Augustine's
ultimatum.

and forbearance would be demanded of Augustine, if this part of his enterprise was to be successful, and the insular Church was to be conformed to the Roman system. Such, however, was not the temper in which Augustine addressed the British bishops. Bede's account is that of a champion of the centralizing or Roman system, yet Bede sufficiently shows that Augustine's demeanour intensified rather than allayed the prejudices of the native Christians. The place of meeting was afterwards called Augustine's Oak (perhaps Austcliffe on the Severn). Here the Roman missionary descanted on the errors of the Britons, especially reprobating their observance of Easter according to the eighty-four years cycle. He cured a blind man as a proof of his divine legation. The insular clergy were impressed by the miracle, but demanded time to confer with their own people on the propriety of the desired changes. Again seven bishops and many learned men from Bangor Iscoed met Augustine, and now it was that his arrogant demeanour provoked his interlocutors to assume the attitude of antagonism. The conference ended in a decided rupture. Augustine haughtily propounded his ultimatum. "I ask but three things of you," he said: "one, that you should keep Easter as we do; another, that you should complete the office of Baptism according to the use of the holy and Apostolic Roman Church; a third, that you should join us in preaching to the Angles. With your other peculiarities we shall patiently bear." The Britons refused to accept these terms, or acknowledge their proposer as archbishop. Alluding to his discourtesy in receiving them sitting, they said, "If he deigns not now to rise up to us, how much more will he slight us when we shall

have accepted his authority." Augustine parted from them with a prediction that "they who refused to show their neighbours the way of life should by them be put to death."¹ Bede shows how the prophecy was accomplished when Ethelfrid, the pagan King of Northumbria, defeated the Welsh at Chester, and massacred the twelve hundred monks of Bangor Iscoed. The date (613) precludes the modern theory that Augustine had used influence with Ethelbert to induce Ethelfrid to invade Wales.

CHAP.
II.

The rup-
ture.

We have adopted the usual course in assigning to the story of Augustine more space than it really deserves. Augustine's visit to England was really but one episode in a record of missionary enterprise which extends over at least a hundred years. Under Augustine and his compatriots Kent and Essex became for a time Christian settlements. A work in Northumberland was also begun by Paulinus, only to be swept away when the reigning dynasty was ousted by the heathen Penda. Such is the brief sum of the results, as far as conversion is concerned. We consider, however, that a peculiar interest attaches to this Roman mission in that it laid the groundwork of our still surviving ecclesiastical organization. Other missionaries won the converts; Gregory and Augustine provided the system by which, when resuscitated by Theodore, those converts became the organized Anglican Church.

Augustine's
work over-
rated.

Augustine died in 604, having appointed and consecrated his compatriot Laurentius as his successor at Canterbury. Laurentius was as dependent on Rome as Augustine, but seems not to have obtained the honour of the pallium. He opened a correspondence with the Christians of Ireland, hoping to bring them

Kent and
Essex re-
lapse.

¹ Bede, Hist. Eccl., li. 2.

CHAP.

II.

A.D. 604

into conformity with the Roman Church.¹ His demands were somewhat similar to those of Augustine, and met with as little success. Soon indeed the Roman mission appeared likely to lose even the small territory which had formed the province of its first archbishop. Eadbald, Ethelbert's son and successor, refused to dissolve his union with his father's widow at the bidding of Laurentius. Such marriages had been customary in the heathen times: the archbishop's persistency only prejudiced the king against Christianity. The people, who had followed their chieftains in thousands to the pool of Baptism, were now as loyal in reasserting the dignity of Thor and Odin. In a few months Kent and Essex had relapsed into paganism. The bishops, Justus and Mellitus, fled before a storm of persecution. Laurentius bravely remained; and by influences which Bede² connects with supernatural occurrences, such as can only be categorized as "pious frauds," prevailed on Eadbald to accept the Christian faith and dissolve his unhallowed marriage. Christianity again became the professed religion of his kingdom. Justus was recalled to Rochester, but Eadbald could not persuade the pagan Londoners to receive Mellitus. Justus and Mellitus successively presided at Canterbury after the death of Laurentius.

Temporary
success of
Paulinus in
Northumbria.

The short-lived offshoot in Northumbria remains to be noticed.

Eadbald's sister, Ethelburga, had married Edwin, King of Northumbria, it being stipulated that she should be allowed free exercise of her religion. Paulinus accompanied her to the court of the heathen bridegroom, and, in deference to the scheme originally devised by Gregory, was consecrated by the primate

¹ See Bæda, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 4.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 6.

Justus to a see at York. By appeals to a mind naturally superstitious, and by prediction of successes on the battle-field, he gained a hold over Edwin which resulted in his conversion to Christianity. The leading men of his kingdom assembling in council gave unanimous adhesion to the new religion; Coifi the pontiff setting the example by confessing that the service of the paternal gods had never brought him any material good.¹ The temple of the disavowed religion was profaned and burnt; and York Minster was anticipated by a humble wooden edifice, the metropolitan church of the North. Edwin was baptized on Easter Day, 627, and the example of the royal proselyte caused, as usual, the conversion of numerous subjects. The new religion was afterwards extended throughout Northumbria by less questionable influences; and we are told that Paulinus devoted himself to incessant preaching and catechizing. Like the kindred foundation in Essex, however, the Northumbrian settlement depended on the life of its royal patron. Eight years after his baptism, Edwin died in battle. A pagan reaction set in, and Paulinus fled with the widowed queen to Kent, the only province in which Gregory's missionaries had secured a permanent hold. Honorius, the Archbishop of Canterbury, appointed Paulinus to the see of Rochester. When Honorius died, some sixty years after the landing of Augustine, the only suffragan see in connection with Canterbury was the neighbouring town of Rochester. For two years the see of Canterbury remained void, an anomaly which has been ascribed to the jealousy of Wessex and Northumbria.

The failure of Gregory's envoys was retrieved by missionaries who knew nothing of papal supremacy, Intervention of missionaries

¹ Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 25, 26.

CHAP.

II.

from Scot-
land.

and whose customs were to some extent different from those of Rome. On this account their work has received but scant acknowledgment at the hands of historians who wrote when the Roman system had obtained the mastery.

We have described in the preceding chapter the Christian settlements planted by the Welsh and Irish among the Picts of Scotland. It was by ecclesiastics connected with this North British Church that the permanent establishment of Christianity in the greater part of England was effected. About the year 634, there succeeded to the throne of Northumbria a prince who had been baptized and taught by the monks of Scotland. Oswald's first care was to send to Hy for a bishop who should rescue his subjects from the darkness of Paganism. Cormac came first, but found himself unfitted by temperament for a work requiring the utmost patience and self-control. Aidan, a man of great meekness and discretion, took his place.¹ Ignorant or heedless of the organization which Gregory had prescribed, Aidan placed his see not at York, but in Lindisfarne, afterwards called Holy Island. Hither he summoned a band of missionaries from the establishments of Columban in the North, and by their exertions Christianity was spread throughout the twin Northumbrian provinces of Bernicia and Deira. At the court of Northumbria Prince Peada of Mercia learnt Christianity. He took back with him to his father's kingdom four missionary priests—Cedda, Adda, Betti, and Diuma. Labouring among the people as much as among the nobles, these preachers gained for Christianity a permanent hold in the affections of the Mercians.² Finan, also a disciple of the college at Hy, had succeeded

A.D. 634.

¹ Beda, Hist. Eccl., iii. 5, 6, 14.

² Ibid., iii. 21.

Aidan at Lindisfarne. By Finan, Diuma was consecrated as the first bishop of the Mercians. The centre of the episcopal see was Lichfield. Oswy, the successor of Oswald, persuaded Sigebert, King of Essex, to embrace the faith. Here again a North British missionary was sent for. The missionary was Cedda. He succeeded in establishing Christianity in Essex, and was consecrated by Finan as Bishop of London.¹ East Anglia was converted by the exertions of Felix, a Burgundian missionary, with whom Fursy, a Celtic monk, co-operated. Felix received no assistance from Canterbury. In Wessex there appeared a Roman missionary, sent by Pope Honorius, who laboured with much success, and established the see of Dorchester, near Oxford. It is a singular fact that Honorius, in sending Birinus, took no notice of the establishment at Canterbury. Sussex was the last kingdom to receive Christianity, a fact which speaks little for the zeal of the neighbouring Church of Kent. Its king, Ædilwalch, was converted at the court of Wulfhere, King of Mercia. But the recovery of the tribe from heathenism and barbarous practices was reserved for Wilfrid, whose labours will be described below.

CHAP.

II.

A.D. 642.

A collision between the two great missionary schools was unavoidable. As might have been foreseen, the insular system was the one to succumb. The pretensions of the Papacy won the victory for the foreign ritual; and the acceptance of the Roman Easter prepared England for a defined ecclesiastical organization such as Gregory had contemplated. Setting aside the means by which it was attained, such an issue is hardly matter of regret. The verdict was given at a synod held at Whitby (Streaneshale) in 664. The

Collision
between
the two
systems.¹ Bede, Hist. Eccl., iii. 21, 22.

CHAP.

II.

Council of
Whitby.
A.D. 664.

two uses had come into collision at the court of Oswy, the very centre of North British influences. Oswy had married Eanfleda, the daughter of Edwin and the Kentish Ethelburga. From the Church of Canterbury Eanfleda had learnt the importance of keeping Easter according to the Roman use. Her husband observed it as he was directed by the Church of North Britain. Hence the scandal that one part of the court feasted while the other part kept fast. The matter was referred to a synod, to which the two Churches sent representatives. Oswy, who presided, dilated on the value of uniformity and the duty of ascertaining which was the best tradition. Thereupon, on behalf of the British Easter, Bishop Colman cited the authority of S. John, of Anatolius the ecclesiastical historian, and of S. Columban. The champions of Roman usage were Wilfrid, under whose tuition Oswy's son had been educated, and Agilbert Bishop of Dorchester. Wilfrid treated the arguments of Colman with unconcealed contempt: he appealed to continental usage, to the Council of Nicæa, to the supreme power delegated to the Roman Church by S. Peter. This last argument was considered decisive by Oswy. Colman having admitted that S. Peter kept the keys of heaven, "then," said the king, "I will not contradict him, lest when I come to the gates of heaven there should be no one to open them, if he is my adversary."¹ The assembly agreed with Oswy. Colman and such of his adherents as were unconvinced retired to their monasteries; Cedda, with the mass of English Christians, conformed to the Roman usages. But it was not till about 716 that the monastic stations of the North accepted the coronal tonsure and the Roman computation of Easter.

¹ Bæda, Hist. Eccl., ii. 13.

CHAPTER III.

The National Anglo-Saxon Church.

A.D. 664-1066.

Steps taken to consolidate the Heptarchic Church—Archbishop Theodore—Case of Wilfrid—Subdivision of large dioceses—Extended organization—The parochial system—Great literary impulse—Anglo-Saxon Church in its relations to Rome—Allegiance uncertain, *e.g.* in the case of Wilfrid—The one Church of the Heptarchic kingdoms—Its capacity for corporate action—Its relations to the tribal systems—Fusion of Church and State—Maintenance of clergy—The parish church—Treatment of heathen practices—Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church—Celibacy of clergy—Penitential system—The age of great writers—Bede—Egbert of York—Cædmon the poet—Aldhelm—Alcuin—And great missionaries—Willibrord—Boniface—Mania for monasticism—And pilgrimages—Council of Cloveshoo—The archbishopric of Lichfield sanctioned by Rome—Peter's pence—England and the iconoclastic controversy—Union of the principalities—The Church shaken by the Danish invasion—Alfred—John Scotus Erigena—The dogma of transubstantiation—The False Decretals—Conflict between regulars and seculars—Odo—Dunstan—Elfric the homilist—Canute—Edward the Confessor—A glance at Church history abroad—Progress of the centralizing system—Its advantages—The period closes on a harmonious state of things—Which is completely transformed in the age ensuing.

In the kingdoms of the Heptarchy the triumph of Roman usage was from this time insured. The idea of conformity naturally suggested that of unity; and Oswy's recognition of the Roman Easter was succeeded by measures for consolidating the independent Heptarchic sees in a national Church, such as had been conceived of by Gregory. The first step was to secure a primate to whom the bishops of the several kingdoms would render obedience. Northumbria and Kent, the two chief centres of Christian agency, seem to have come to an understanding on this point, without con-

Steps
taken to
consolidate
the Hep-
tarchic
Church.

CHAP.
III.

A.D. 667.

sulting the great kingdoms of Mercia and Wessex, Oswy and Egbert agreed that Canterbury was the metropolitan see of England. Frithona, a Saxon, who after its two years' vacation was consecrated to this see with the title Deusdedit, had lately died. The kings of Northumbria and Kent selected Wighard as his successor, and sent him to Rome for consecration. Wighard died shortly after his arrival at Rome. It appears that the kings, when informed of this event, petitioned Pope Vitalian to nominate a primate.¹ The archbishopric of Canterbury was offered by Vitalian to Adrian, a learned monk of African birth. Adrian refused, but recommended his friend Theodore, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, and Theodore was consecrated at Rome in March, 668. Travelling very leisurely, he came to Canterbury, accompanied by Adrian, in May, 669.

Archbishop
Theodore.

Theodore of Tarsus was gifted by nature with talents of the highest order, and his advanced age at the time of his appointment had in no way impaired these endowments. He stands first chronologically among the primates of all England; and, if not first, among the foremost in point of ability and historical importance. The bishops of the Heptarchy appear to have submitted to their new ecclesiastical chief with a unanimity for which Theodore's personal reputation and Roman credentials sufficiently account.

Case of
Wilfrid:

The first case which Theodore had to decide was that of the Northumbrian bishopric. Oswy had re-established York as the northern see, and Tuda, one of the Scotch divines, had occupied it till his death. Wilfrid, the champion of Roman usage at Whitby, had been appointed to succeed him. It was characteristic

¹ This fact is vainly contested by Mr. Soames: see Kemble, *Saxons in England*, fl. 365 and note.

of Wilfrid that he should scorn to be consecrated by insular prelates. The British and Scotch episcopate was spurned because not clearly connected with Rome. Deusdedit's purer pedigree was not sufficient to atone for a latent sympathy with the "schismatic" Celts. Wilfrid went to Paris, and was there consecrated by Archbishop Agilbert. His scruples did not preclude a protracted absence from his new see, which induced Oswy to fill up his place by the appointment of Chad, brother to Cedda. Chad had been consecrated by Wine, the Bishop of Winchester, assisted by two British bishops. Wilfrid now appealed to Theodore to reinstall him. It is not pleasing to learn that Theodore's policy or conviction induced him to rule that a consecration in which the native prelates¹ had taken part was uncanonical, and that Chad's claim was therefore invalid. Wilfrid was restored. Chad retired cheerfully to his beloved abbey at Lastingham, to be raised shortly to the see of Lichfield, when he submitted to a second consecration.

Hitherto Christianity in England had been represented by bishoprics coextensive with kingdoms.² Some of these were far too vast for the care of one diocesan. This arrangement was also a bar to corporate action on the part of the Church, the bishops being too much associated with the conflicting interests of the several principalities to regard themselves as members of a religious fraternity. Theodore would obviously have to face the unpopular enterprise of subdividing the dioceses. Before taking steps in this direction,

Subdivision
of large
dioceses.

¹ Or, to speak more strictly, such of the native prelates as did not accept the Roman Easter and tonsure. See *Capitula et Fragmenta Theodori*, Thorpe, 307.

² "Kent," says Mr. Kemble, "is probably only an apparent exception. Rochester can hardly have been otherwise than the capital of a subordinate kingdom."—*Saxons in England*, vol. II. p. 361.

CHAP.

III.

A.D. 673.

he wisely endeavoured to make the suffragans realize the advantages of a more elaborate ecclesiastical system. He convened a synod at Hertford (673), at which he produced a body of canon law, ranged under ten heads, which he specially commended to the acceptance of those present.¹ These canons prescribe the Roman Easter; lay down certain rules for bishops, clergy, and monks; provide for the holding of synods twice in every year; and order penalties for breach of the matrimonial tie. They were examined and accepted by the synod in the name of the entire Church. Cloveshoo was appointed as the meeting-place² of a yearly synod. The scheme for breaking up the big dioceses was broached, and received some sort of sanction, one of the canons prescribing that as the number of the faithful increased the bishops might be increased to greater number. Theodore began at once to avail himself of this canon. East Anglia was provided with two sees, at Elmham and at Dunwich. Mercia, in spite of Winfrid's opposition, received the sees of Hereford, Worcester, and Leicester in addition to Lichfield. In Northumbria Wilfrid had lost court favour. Egfrid and his queen themselves urged Theodore to break up the unwieldy diocese of York. Wilfrid made resistance; and was deposed, if not degraded, by Theodore, who had previously treated Winfrid with similar severity. The Northumbrian diocese was ultimately apportioned between Whithern, Lindisfarne, Hexham, and Sidnacester. Wessex alone of the large kingdoms succeeded in escaping disruption. Its apportionment to Winchester and Sherborne was effected

¹ The bishops of East Anglia, Rochester, Wessex, and Mercia were personally present. Wilfrid of Northumbria sent two representatives. Several learned divines of lower grade attended.

² Bæda, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 5.

very shortly after Theodore's death. The Church then found itself ranged under sixteen sees, subject to one metropolitan at Canterbury.¹

CHAP.
III.

With the subdivision of dioceses came a great development of the monastic system, and the establishment of some form of provision for the village clergy. That Theodore himself is the author of the arrangement, by which the patronage of the Church and the maintenance of the incumbent lay in the founder's family,² is a tradition of little value. Nor is it plain that England was now adapted to any foreign form of parochial system. "What measures Theodore, who is the traditional creator of the parochial system, took in this direction can only be conjectured: it is unnecessary to suppose that he founded it, for it needed no foundation. As the kingdom and the shire were the natural sphere of the bishop, so was the township of the single priest; and the parish was but the township or cluster of townships to which the priest ministered. The fact that the two systems, the parish and the township, have existed for more than one thousand years side by side, identical in area, and administered by the same persons, and yet separate in

Extended
organiza-
tion.

The paro-
chial sys-
tem.

¹ This arrangement was so far altered in 735 that York, then presided over by the celebrated Egbert, became the metropolitan see of the northern dioceses of Lindisfarne, Hexham, and Whithern. It may be remarked here that the ambiguous relations of York and Canterbury proved a fruitful source of contention in the Anglo-Norman times. Thus Thomas of York tried to resist Lanfranc, maintaining that the primacy ought to be held alternately by Canterbury, York, and London. On Anselm's accession Thomas established his own claim to the rank of "metropolitan" (1093). The prerogative of Canterbury was in that year first expressed in the terms which still obtain—"totius Britanniae Primas." Half a century later, at the petition of Archbishop Theobald, the pre-eminence of Canterbury was put beyond dispute by the primate's becoming "Legatus Natus" of the Roman see by virtue of his office. During the Saxon period, however, the subordinate position of York was not often questioned. Nor was Theodore's scheme shaken by Offa's attempt to establish a third archbishopric in the midlands (787). The pretensions of Lichfield did not survive Archbishop Higbert.

² See Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 285, 286.

CHAP.
III.Great
literary
impulse.

character and machinery, is a sufficient proof that no legislative act could have been needed."¹

The services rendered to literature by Theodore and his friend Adrian are scarcely less important than this work of ecclesiastical organization. Theodore has been called the father of Anglo-Saxon literature. With his primacy came an educational impulse somewhat like that of the "New Learning" in the sixteenth century. It was not till the destruction of the monasteries by the Northmen that this impulse subsided. By that time English scholars, such as Bede and Alcuin, had won a European reputation, and the skill of our monastic copyists became proverbial. "In a single century England became known as a fountain of light, as a land of learned men, devout and unwearied missions, of strong, rich, and pious kings."² Himself a Greek divine, Theodore introduced into England a class of studies almost unknown in Western Christendom. For the special study of his native language he founded a school at Canterbury, on which he bestowed a number of books. Greek copies of the Scriptures were transmitted from the East, and copied with assiduous care by the monks of England.³ The Codex E.,⁴ one of the most precious treasures of the Bodleian, is supposed to be one of the manuscripts with which Theodore enriched England. It is related by Bede that the primate and Adrian themselves gave oral instruction to students in every branch of scholarship. Other names besides those of Theodore and Adrian deserve mention in connection with the revival of

¹ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 227.² *Ibid.*, i. 219.

³ The value of such services can hardly be rightly estimated in our own days. It is difficult to conceive of an entire Christian diocese in which not one copy of the Old or New Testament in any language existed. Yet such Mr. Kemble shows to have been the state of the diocese of Lisieux in the 9th century: see Saxons in England, ii. 433, note.

⁴ Or Laudianus, 35.

literature. Wilfrid, to borrow Dean Milman's expression, returned from his visits to Rome "with other literary treasures besides papal rescripts in his favour." Benedict Biscop, who had accompanied Wilfrid to Rome in 654, was equally assiduous as a collector of books. It was by these two Northumbrian scholars that the celebrated monastery at the mouth of the Wear was founded. Here their spoils were deposited; and here Benedict brought John the Precentor from Rome itself, to teach his monks the knowledge of Latin and of sacred music. The next generation witnessed the foundation of a library of probably greater value. This was Archbishop Egbert's collection at York. Of the contents Alcuin, Egbert's librarian, gives a catalogue, which includes all the great ecclesiastical writers and not a few of the Latin classics.

The anti-papal proclivities of some historians have been gratified by a hint supplied by Bede, which suggests that Pope Vitalian mistrusted the allegiance of the Greek primate to the customs of the Roman see. Mr. Soames discovers that Theodore's friend Adrian was "a spy upon his actions," and that Vitalian "gladly renewed" this espionage by means of John the Precentor. It is probable that Theodore's Greek birth and independence of character did actually make him somewhat impatient of Roman interference. Rome was undoubtedly regarded in England as the metropolis of Christendom, and the decision of the Roman synod which condemned the Monothelites was dutifully endorsed by a convention at Hatfield (680). But the pretensions of the Pope were still vague and undefined. How precarious was the allegiance of England to S. Peter's representative is shown by the history of Wilfrid.

Anglo-Saxon Church in its relations to Rome.

Deposed by Theodore from the see of York, Wil- Allegiance

CHAP.

III.

uncertain,
e.g. in the
case of
Wilfrid.

A.D. 679.

frid journeyed to Rome to secure papal interposition. Some kind of synod held at Rome pronounced his deposition uncanonical, and Pope Agatho gave him a letter which set forth this decision. Of so little value, however, was papal support,¹ that Wilfrid only returned to Northumbria to be imprisoned for nine months by King Egfrid, and then banished the kingdom. The subsequent career of Wilfrid is too interesting for us to end the story here. Undaunted by failure and disgrace, he journeyed into the barbarous province of Sussex, to strike out a new career as a missionary. The natives of Sussex were savages, so ignorant that Wilfred was hailed as their preserver when, in a season of scarcity, he taught them how to catch fish. He soon established a bishopric at Selsey, and the fame of his missionary labours reached the ears of Theodore. The aged archbishop seems to have thought that a man of such ability as Wilfrid would be a fit successor to himself at Canterbury. He appealed to Alfrid, the successor of Egfrid, to reinstate the exiled prelate at York. Wilfrid, somewhat unhappily for his fame, returned to Northumbria. Fresh disputes arose, the ground being (according to Eddius) Wilfrid's continued aversion to the dismemberment of the Northumbrian see, and his repudiation² of some of Theodore's canons. Again driven into exile, he again journeyed to Rome, and again a papal rescript in Wilfrid's favour was disregarded by the secular and ecclesiastical authorities of England. It was not till after Alfrid's death that Wilfrid was allowed to repossess

¹ He was accused of obtaining it by bribes: see Eddius, Vit. S. Wilfr., xxxiii.

² He taunted the synod at Eastanfeld with Theodore's non-compliant attitude towards Rome. Did they dare, he asked, compare their schismatic prelate with "holy Agatho, and Benedict the chosen, and Sergius the blessed?" The authority is Eddius, who was probably present at the synod.

himself of a part of his former dominions. He recovered the see of Hexham and the abbey of Ripon; and these he held peaceably during the last four years of his life. He died in 709. His zeal for Italian usage and his invocation of Roman authority were rewarded in after years by the posthumous honour of canonization, which has been denied to Theodore,¹ a greater divine but less dutiful servant of Rome.

CHAP.
III.

So readily had the organization provided by Theodore been accepted, that from this time (more than a hundred years before the Heptarchic kingdoms were united under one temporal head) the Church of England maintained its unity and capacity for corporate action. The secular organization of England was one of disintegrated tribes, whose princes rarely met in council, and whose occasional coalition was a mere political accident. Its ecclesiastical organization, on the other hand, was based on the corporate action of its clergy. The bishops and abbots convened harmoniously from all parts of England, and passed canons which were accepted by the entire "ecclesia Anglorum et Saxonum."² From time to time this harmony may have been disturbed by the doubtful claim of York, or the baseless pretence of Lichfield, to a primacy akin to that of Canterbury; but such survival of tribal jealousy appears at no time to have effected absolute breach of communion. It may be added that the ecclesiastical polity of England was extended to regions which still defied the military skill of her temporal chieftains.

The one
Church of
the Hep-
tarchic
kingdoms.

A.D. 680-
800.

¹ Theodore died in 690, Achian in 680.

² Mr. Stubbs remarks (Const. Hist., vol. i. p. 173): "The unity of the Church was the only working unity, the law of religion the only universally recognized common jurisprudence. The Archbishop of Canterbury stood constantly, as the Bretwalda never stood, at the head of an organized and symmetrical system, all of the officers of which were bound by their profession of obedience to him."

CHAP.
III.

Wales gradually changed its attitude of jealous conservatism, and for ecclesiastical purposes became almost part and parcel of England. It had adopted the Anglican usages before the end of the eighth century: after the beginning of the ninth there are instances of Welsh bishops going to Canterbury for consecration.

Its capacity
for corpo-
rate action.

The Anglo-Saxon Church may be depicted from two distinct points of view, according as we regard it in its entirety, or in its relation to the several principalities.

(1.) The bishops, the abbots, and perhaps the delegates of the parochial clergy met from time to time in ecclesiastical Councils. Their canons bore solely on the spiritual concerns of the nation; but they were not binding on the clergy only. Kings and ealdormen were sometimes present at these Councils (as *e.g.* Offa at Calcuith in 787, and Kenulf at Chelsea in 816), and even attested their decrees. But it does not appear that they were permitted to take part in the conciliar legislation. Theodore had provided that these Councils should be held annually at Cloveshoo. This arrangement was not observed with respect to time, nor even with respect to place. The Councils were convened rarely, to meet important exigencies: the places selected were often such border towns as were most accessible. Thus Boniface's complaints induced Archbishop Cuthbert to convene the synod at Cloveshoo in 747, which passed canons for the amelioration of morals. The synod at Calcuith, in 787, met to consider Offa's important scheme for making Lichfield a metropolitan see.

Its rela-
tions to the
tribal sys-
tems.

(2.) The tribal relations of the clergy are a subject of greater intricacy and importance. It appears that as the Saxon kingdoms were converted, an adaptation of the tribal institutions took place, which resulted in what we should now call a union of Church and

State. The government in these kingdoms was, as is well known, constitutional. Each had its Witenagemot; and therein sat bishops, and sometimes abbots, and perhaps other clergy, with the ealdormen of the shires and the king's thegns. Ecclesiastical matters, as well as secular, were certainly discussed by the tribal Witan; and it is not easy to define how its "dooms" were subordinated to those of the ecclesiastical Witan or national Church Council. The king and the Witan legislated on such matters as the sanctity of oaths and marriage vows; the enforcement of Sundays and holy days; the levy and expenditure of ecclesiastical revenue; and the appointment of fasts and festivals. Bishops, it seems, were often nominated in the Witan, though in the case of the less important sees election by the clergy appears to have been the rule. Christianity soon penetrated the judicial and executive institutions of the Anglo-Saxons. The bishop sat with the earl in the county court, besides taking cognizance of a certain class of offences in his own court. The State facilitated the execution of the episcopal sentence, even where purely spiritual: "the outlaw of God and the outlaw of the king, the excommunicated man and the convicted criminal, are alike set without the protection of the peace." Clerical criminals, however, were not let off, as in a later age, with spiritual sentences. They were punished as other citizens. In like manner the usual secular services were exacted from the lands belonging to the clergy. Except in a few rare cases, clerical property was subject to the *trinoda necessitas*¹—maintenance of roads and bridges, maintenance of forts, and maintenance of troops.

Fusion of
Church and
State.

¹ See Palgrave's *Engl. Commonwealth*, I. 157-159.

CHAP.

III.

Maintenance of
clergy.

This brings us to the subject of the incomes of the clergy, and the legal provisions for their sustenance. Tithe-payment, customary since the fourth century, had been declared obligatory at the synod of Tours in 567; and there is little doubt that at the conversion of Anglo-Saxon England this mode of providing for the clergy¹ was introduced. The ecclesiastical Council at Calcuith (787) treats tithe-payment as an established practice. But no distinct legislation on this subject occurs till 920, when Athelstan and the national Witan enjoin the payment of the tenth "of live stock and of the year's increase." The same payment is enjoined by Edmund's law of 940. The laws passed by Ina² and his Witan in 693 enforce on every house an assessment called "cyric-sceat," or "church-scot," to defray the expenses of divine service. Church-scot was to be paid in kind every Martinmas. This impost is enforced by many subsequent legislative acts of the period. "Leohtsceat" and "sawlsceat" were the names of certain other dues payable to the Church. If we except the hide of glebe land sometimes attached to the Church for the maintenance of the parish priest, ecclesiastical property of every kind was in the hands of the bishop. The dues above mentioned did not accrue directly to the clergy. They fed a diocesan fund, which was apportioned by the bishop according to fixed rules. The usual custom of the Roman Church was to divide all oblations into four parts—one for the bishop, one for the clergy, one for the poor, and one for the repairs and ornamentation of the church. In England usually a tripartite³ division obtained, one-third being allotted to the bishop and clergy. This arrangement

¹ See Theodore, *Pœnit.*, lib. ii. 2, and ii. 14.

² LL. Inæ, 4, 10; Spelm., i. 184, 185.

³ *Excerpta Egberti*, 5.

appears to be accounted for by the monastic character of the early bishops. Gregory expressly directed Augustine to make, not four, but three portions, because he, being a monk, could have no separate share of his own.

CHAP.
III.

The formation of parishes has been already alluded to. Here again Christianity was interwoven with the existent secular institutions of Anglo-Saxon England, the parish being only one or more of the already defined townships. The "monasterium" or episcopal church served as a kind of missionary depôt. Its travelling preachers were gradually transformed into parish priests, "presbyteri plebei," as provision was secured for the maintenance of a resident clergy. This change doubtless went on briskly under Theodore's régime. Hence, perhaps, the legend that he introduced the parochial system into England from the East. In the time of Bede parish churches had been generally established throughout England. Mr. Kemble accounts for this speedy upgrowth by the supposition that in most cases the heathen temple (the *fanum* or *hearth*) was appropriated to Christian use. In this connection it may be observed that heathen practices were to some extent incorporated in the Christianity of Anglo-Saxon England. The most remarkable survival is that of the "ordeal." This relic of Teutonic superstition was condemned by Pope Stephen V. in the ninth century, and again by Alexander II. in the eleventh. But in England no active measures for its suppression¹ were taken until the reign of Henry III. Other ancient practices, however, deemed of a less innocent character, were jealously proscribed. The Saxon rules with regard to prohibited degrees of marriage had been so indulgent that union with a widowed stepmother was a common

The parish
church.

Treatment
of heathen
practices.

¹ See Johnson, sub an. 1065, can. 2.

CHAP.
III.

practice. The matrimonial restrictions introduced by Christianity must therefore have been often found an intolerable burden. The Church forbade marriage within four degrees of consanguinity, or with sponsors, nuns, or divorced women. It also discouraged second marriages. The zeal of the prelates in enforcing these provisions is illustrated by the episode of Odo and the unfortunate Elgiva. It was perhaps to guard against some barbarous practice of the old religion that the Anglo-Saxon canons maintained the primitive prohibitions with regard to tasting of blood or of strangled animals.¹

Doctrines
of the
Anglo-
Saxon
Church.Celibacy of
clergy.Penitential
system.

The ritual, and the doctrinal tenets of the Anglo-Saxon Christians were, broadly, such as prevailed among their contemporaries at Rome. Latin was the language of public worship. The priest was ordained to "offer sacrifice and celebrate mass as well for the living as for the dead." Celibacy was theoretically the rule of life for the parochial clergy as well as for the monks; but the denunciations of Boniface in the eighth, and Dunstan in the tenth century, were vainly launched against the prevalent contrary practice.² The Anglo-Saxon divines are prolific sources of instruction on the subject of penance. Theodore's bulky Penitential was succeeded by the similar productions of Archbishop Egbert, Cummian, and Elfric. Every conceivable form of sin is assessed in these works, to be commuted by a proportionate fasting, money payment, or repetition of

¹ Egbert's Penitential: see Johnson's Collection, i. can. 40; Wilkins, i. 124.

² Wilfrid's son is mentioned by Eddius. A church is left hereditarily to Wulfmaer and his offspring: the sons of Bishop Ælfsige, Oswald the presbyter, and other clerics are mentioned. Mr. Kemble concludes that there is "an almost unbroken chain of evidence to show that, in spite of the exhortations of the bishops and the legislation of the Witan, those at least of the clergy who were not bound to cœnobitical order did contract marriage and openly rear the families which were its issue."—*Saxons in England*, vol. ii. p. 443.

psalms. The apology for such a system was the hardened spiritual condition of the Anglo-Saxons, who were, as we have shown, notorious abroad for violence and inhumanity. It need not be remarked what a scope it offered for abuse. Rome was regarded as the centre of Christendom, and, as a rule, dutifully obeyed. Two notable exceptions may be alleged. Image-worship and transubstantiation, as will be shown hereafter, were both rejected by the Church of England, despite the sanction they received from Rome.

The eighth century is the golden age of the Anglo-Saxon period. At Benedict Biscop's colleges at Wearmouth and Jarrow was educated the theologian and historian Bede, called by the succeeding generation "venerabilis." The celebrity of Bede was such as to justify a tradition that Pope Sergius invited him to give Rome the benefit of his erudition. To modern readers Bede's theological works are of little value. They are merely excerpts from the great Christian Fathers, to whom we have, what Bede's countrymen had not, a more direct means of access. Just as Jerome had thrown open the Scriptures to the less learned minds of Western Christendom, so Bede revealed S. Augustine to Saxon England. Standing aloof alike from ecclesiastical duties and ecclesiastical disputes, the monk of Jarrow made it his life's work to master, and to disseminate in his writings, the literary treasures accumulated by Wilfrid and Benedict Biscop. Posterity, however, has forgotten Saxon England's obligations to Bede as an exponent of patristic thought. His fame now rests on what his contemporaries probably considered his least valuable work, the Ecclesiastical History of England. To this record, compiled from ancient records, tradition, and personal knowledge,

The age of
great
writers.

Bede.

CHAP.
III.

we are indebted for almost all that we know of the England of the sixth and seventh centuries. Bede died in the act of completing a vernacular translation of S. John's Gospel (735).

Egbert of
York.

To Bede's learned friend, Archbishop Egbert of York, we have already alluded, as the founder of a valuable library and author of a vernacular Penitential. It is important to notice that Egbert's episcopate restored York to the metropolitan dignity, to which it had made no pretensions since the death of Paulinus. It may be conceived that the high connections of Egbert, whose brother Edbert was King of Northumbria, helped to secure him this dignity. Egbert's prelacy lasted from 732 to 766. Of Cædmon, the greatest of Anglo-Saxon poets, and his sudden acquisition of a talent for which he had no natural bent, we are told by Bede, who was not many years his senior. Cædmon's lips were opened by an angel, who bid him sing of the "Creation." In language in which his countrymen saw a beauty which they attributed to inspiration, Cædmon poured forth "the treasures of Biblical poetry, the sublime mysteries of the Creation, the Fall, the wonders of the Hebrew history, the gentler miracles of the New Testament, the terrors of the judgment, the torments of hell, the bliss of heaven. . . . Thus was the whole history of the Bible, and the whole creed of Christianity in the imaginative form which it then wore, made at once accessible to the Anglo-Saxon people.¹ Cædmon's poetry was their Bible, no doubt far more effective in awakening and changing the popular mind than a literal translation of the Scriptures could have been."² In

Cædmon
the poet.

¹ Probably at a later time vernacular translations of most of the Scriptures were executed. The Gospels were certainly translated more than once, as also the Psalms. Elfric translated the Pentateuch and the historical Books of the Old Testament.

² Milman, *Lat. Christ.*, vol. ii. pp. 277, 278.

like manner the unimpressive sermons of the clergy were supplemented by the improvised utterances of the poet-preacher, Aldhelm of Malmesbury. Unfortunately for his reputation, Aldhelm also attempted Latin verses, and these are all that survive of his poetical productions. CHAP.
III.

Alcuin, the scholar and statesman, emerges from Egbert's college at York, as Bede does from the foundations of Benedict, and aspired to yet loftier rank among the Anglo-Saxon worthies. Aldhelm.

Alcuin made his *Alma Mater* so famous by his own talent for oral tuition that York was the resort of the theological students of the Continent. His friend and former pupil, Eanbald, when raised to the see of York, desired Alcuin to procure him the pall at Rome. The journey was destined to sever England's connection with the great luminary of the age. At Parma Alcuin was presented to Charlemagne, who contrived to secure his future residence at the Frankish court. As the privy councillor of the emperor, Alcuin made his influence felt over all Europe. Once only was he permitted to revisit England. His ostensible mission was to negotiate a treaty between Charlemagne and Offa; but he prolonged his stay three years, in spite of the emperor's remonstrances. In his old age Alcuin with difficulty obtained permission to retire to the abbey of S. Martin's at Tours, and devote himself to scholarly pursuits. To Tours¹ flocked students of all countries; and as an authority in all branches of learning, Alcuin survived for centuries. As the author of the so-called Caroline Books, Alcuin renders important testimony to the opinions of the Saxon and Gallican Churches on the controverted subject of image-worship. Alcuin.

Besides these men of letters the English Church pro- A.D. 796. And great

¹ Acta SS. Ord. Benedict., iv. 169, 179.

CHAP.
III.mission-
aries.

Willibrord.

Boniface.

duced at least two celebrated missionaries. Willibrord, with a band of preachers, brought the light of Christianity to the barbarous Batavian tribes at the close of the seventh century, and established a see at Utrecht. Winifrid, or Boniface, the "Apostle of Germany," was born at Crediton in Devonshire, where he received a monastic education. Following the example of Willibrord, he passed over into Friesland in 715. After attaining considerable success, he journeyed to Rome, and received a formal commission to work as an itinerant missionary among the heathen tribes of Northern Europe. On this occasion he took an oath of allegiance to Gregory II. as sole and absolute head of the Church. In 738 he was consecrated Archbishop of Mentz, with the appellation Boniface. A devoted servant of Rome, he procured the synodical submission of Germany to the papal see, and endeavoured to win over England to a like obedience. Writing to Archbishop Cuthbert, Boniface styles himself legate of the Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, and details how the synod at Soissons had decided that every metropolitan must apply to Rome for a pall, and "that in all things we must strive to pay canonical obedience to the household of S. Peter." The relapse of his converts appears to have drawn Boniface back to Friesland in his old age. There he was murdered in 755.

Mania for
monasti-
cism.

But it was in the self-seclusion of the monk and the laborious journeyings of the pilgrim that the religious enthusiasm of this period commonly found expression. The instances of Anglo-Saxon princes and princesses who exchanged the court for the cloister are too numerous to be detailed. Ceolwulf of Northumbria (cir. 725) is said to have been the eighth king who assumed the monastic garb, and the fashion became yet

more prevalent. The Benedictine form of establishment had long been known in England: to this order belonged Biscop's foundation at Wearmouth, that of Cuthbert at Lindisfarne, and the monastery wherein Winifrid received his education. Dunstan, whom his monkish panegyrists style the first of the English Benedictines, really did but restore a system which had been overthrown amid the troubles of the Danish occupation. The female pilgrims from England obtained an unenviable notoriety in continental cities. So indecent was their behaviour, that Boniface¹ wrote to England, asking that the practice of going on pilgrimage should be limited by royal and synodical authority.

CHAP.
III.

And pilgrimages.

It was in deference to the wishes of Boniface that the Council of 747 was held at Cloveshoo. Canons were passed similar to those enforced by the missionary bishop on his German converts. It was enacted that the people should learn the Creed and the Lord's Prayer in the vulgar tongue, and receive instruction as to the nature of the two sacraments; prayers were to be used for the dead; bishops were to visit their dioceses annually. A general conformity with the usages of Rome is enjoined; but that submission to papal authority which Boniface had urged, and which was recommended by Archbishop Cuthbert, was not expressed. On the contrary, no higher court of appeal than that of the archbishop in synod is acknowledged.

Counsel of
Cloveshoo.
A.D. 747.

This submission was, however, rendered in 787 by Offa, King of the Mercians, in furtherance of his own ambition. While a bishop ranked only as an ealdorman, the archbishops held the rank of athelings or princes of the blood, and had the right to issue coinage. It

The arch-
bishopric
of Lichfield
sanctioned
by Rome.

¹ See Spelm., Conc., i. 233; Wilk., i. 88.

CHAP.

III.

A.D. 787.

was natural that when Offa conquered Kent, he should deem it politic to curtail the dignity and authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, by establishing a third archiepiscopate in his own kingdom of Mercia. The new archbishopric of Lichfield survived for about twenty years. Papal connivance, and a pall for the new metropolitan were obtained by enormous bribes;¹ and probably the recognition of the pall as an essential was, at this time, even more grateful to Rome than the money payment. Two legates—the first papal commissioners since the appointment of Theodore—were sent to ratify the new arrangement, which also received the approval of a Council held at Calcuith.² Offa promised the legates that he would subscribe annually to a fund for supporting the English college founded by Ina at Rome and defraying the expenses of pilgrims. The subscription was levied by a tax of a penny on every family not absolutely destitute in his dominions. In this grant originated “Peter’s pence,” claimed from William I. after the Conquest by Pope Gregory VII., and paid with occasional interruptions until its final abrogation in 1559.

Peter’s
pence.

England
and the
iconoclastic
theory.

A controversy as to the kind of devotion due to sacred images had been menacing Christendom from the time of Gregory I. This Pope, with his usual sagacity, had sanctioned the use of images, while deprecating their worship. Sweeping condemnation of such stimulants to devotion was the platform of Leo the Isaurian, and his son Constantine Copronymus, whose opinions were espoused by a Council at Constantinople, in 754. The Empress Irene, on the other hand, reversed

¹ “*Datâ pecuniâ infinitâ, a sede Apostolicâ, quæ nulli deest pecuniam largiente licentiam impetravit.*”—Matt. Paris, *Hist. Ang.*, p. 155.

² “Challoch or Chalk in Kent,” according to Dr. Ingram.

this policy. Through her instrumentality the second Council of Nicæa was summoned to enact that an external and inferior sort of worship might be offered to images (787). The Roman see emphatically pronounced in favour of image-worship. It is certain that the English and Gallican Churches were in this matter at variance with Rome. Under Charlemagne, the celebrated Council of Frankfort, 794, condemned the Council of Nicæa as a pseudo-synod, and the decrees of this Council were transmitted to the Anglo-Saxon clergy. By them the practice of image-worship was absolutely repudiated, as being "that which God's Church altogether execrates."¹ The views of the two Churches were defended by Alcuin in a treatise surviving in the so-called Caroline Books. While preserving the greatest deference to Rome as the metropolis of Christendom, the author plainly proscribes image-worship as an insidious relic of paganism. A.D. 794.

The ninth century introduced a great political change in the consolidation of the various principalities under one ruler. Egbert, who ruled over England south of the Humber (827), was succeeded by Ethelwulf, who is the reputed author of the legislation which subjected the whole country to tithe-payment. It appears, however, that Ethelwulf's enactments did no more than free Church property from a tenth part of the usual imposts,² and that the earliest distinct legislation as to tithe-payment is that of Athelstan, sixty-six years later. Ethelwulf journeyed to Rome, and there restored the English school founded by Ina, which had been destroyed by fire. He appears to have renewed or confirmed the grant of Peter's pence. The religious Union of the principalities.
A.D. 854.

¹ For the canons of this synod see Spelm., Conc., vii. 103.

² See Stubbs, Const. Hist., i. 228, 237; and Kemble, Saxons, ii. 481-490.

CHAP.
III.

The Church
shaken by
the Danish
invasion.

A.D. 878.

Alfred.

John
Scotus
Erigena.

prosperity of England was rudely shaken during this reign by the invasions of the Northmen. Civilization had enervated her soldiers, and little resistance was made until resistance was useless. In the troublous period which ensued the Christian institutions of the island were wellnigh exterminated. Bi-hops and clergy fled from their benefices; literature and peaceful arts succumbed; the religious houses, especially those of Northern England, were pillaged or destroyed. In seven years, it is said, every religious house in Northumbria had ceased to exist. The work of restoration consequent on Alfred's great victory at Ethandune included a re-establishment of the ancient territorial divisions—shires, hundreds, and parishes; a compulsory baptism of the heathen; the founding of schools and colleges; the translation of portions of the Scriptures and other religious books into the native tongue; the manumission of slaves; and a general enforcement of the tenets and practice of Christianity on the lines of Offa and Ina. Alfred prefaces his laws with a version of the Decalogue, in which the second commandment is omitted. From this it is inferred that England no longer reprobated the second Council of Nicæa. It is also noteworthy that Alfred stipulated for the payment of *Rome-sceat* in the laws which enjoin the usual offerings for the maintenance of the clergy. But the tradition of his patronage of John Scotus Erigena, who was deemed heterodox at Rome, indicates that his deference to the papal see was not extravagant. This divine was the only great writer produced by these islands in the ninth century. He appears to have been born in Ireland, and to have spent his earlier years in France, under the patronage of Charles the Bald. By Charles he was employed with Ratramn

to examine the doctrine of transubstantiation lately broached by Paschasius Radbertus. Both scholars condemned the doctrine. This, together with his peculiar views on the subject of predestination, brought Erigena into disrepute at Rome. At Alfred's summons he accepted a post as teacher at the newly founded school at Oxford. Thence he moved to Malmesbury Abbey, where he continued to engage in tuition. He died by the penknives of his pupils,¹ who are supposed to have been incited by some of his theological antagonists.

CHAP.
III.

The doctrine which Erigena repudiated will be frequently alluded to hereafter, and the present appears a suitable place for an account of it. From the earliest times it had been held that there was a veritable but mysterious Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. On this subject all the Fathers are in agreement. Seldom, however, was it attempted to define the nature of Sacramental grace dogmatically. In the liturgies of SS. Basil and Chrysostom this Presence is regarded as so real as to give to the Eucharistic rite a sacrificial character.² In 787 the second Council of Nice determined that the symbols are not figures or images, but the very Body and Blood. Paschasius Radbertus (831) appears to have combined the doctrine of a Real Presence with the philosophical tenet of the times,—that in all bodies there existed a *substance* apart from the *accidents* appreciable by the senses. His followers maintained that after the act of consecration the substance of the sacred elements was changed, albeit the accidents remained. This view was opposed by Erigena, Ratramn a learned monk of Corbey in France, and Rabanus

The dogma
of transub-
stantiation.

A.D. 831.

¹ Malmesb. Script. post Bed, 24.

² See also Chrysost., De Sacerdot., iii. § 4.

CHAP.

III.

Maurus, a disciple of Alcuin. Elfric, the Anglo-Saxon homilist (cir. 995), says distinctly that the consecrated elements "are not the same body that Christ suffered in, nor the same blood in bodily substance that He shed for us;" and during the Anglo-Saxon period our Church appears to have rejected the rationalistic dogma of Radbertus. In the Gallican Church Berengarius (cir. 1050), while admitting the Real Presence in the sacrament, argued that the bread and wine retained their natural substance. But the dogma of "transubstantiation" (a term first applied about 1100) had throughout the controversy been supported by Rome. A Council at Verceil, under Leo IX., condemned John Scotus and Berengarius (1050). Councils held shortly afterwards at Rome endorsed the verdict; and among those who endeavoured to confute Berengarius in writing was Lanfranc, afterwards primate of England. From this time the dogma was generally received.¹ It was formally declared to be an article of faith by the fourth Lateran Council under Innocent III. (A.D. 1215).

The False
Decretals.

Before the middle of the ninth century the *False Decretals* were published by some Gallican ecclesiastic eager to aggrandize Rome. A collection of papal canons and decretals from the pontificate of Siricius to his own time, *i.e.* 384–525, had been made by Dionysius the Less. Isidore of Seville had, in 635, undertaken to revise and complete this collection. The forged decretals, which first saw light about 836, profess to be the work of Isidore. They trace back the decretal epistles of Popes, not to Siricius, but to a period when

¹ When in this work we use the term "transubstantiation" we mean this rationalistic dogma of Radbertus, and not, as some writers, the ancient doctrine of a real, if undefinable, Presence.

no papal decrees were dreamt of; in fact, to the days of Clement, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 91). The False Decretals also contain the so-called Donation of Constantine. Pope Sylvester is herein endowed by Constantine the Great with the empire of Italy and the West, the donor at the same time confessing the dependence of all power, whether ecclesiastical or civil, on the papal see. The Church of Rome is declared to be constituted as head over other Churches by our Lord Himself. The clergy are said to be exempt from secular control, and to be responsible only to their diocesans; these in turn are subject to their metropolitans, and these to the patriarchs, at the head of whom is the successor of Peter. The False Decretals, though now acknowledged to be a clumsy forgery, teeming with anachronisms, were universally accepted in the Middle Ages, and were of great influence in establishing the papal supremacy. Nicholas I. is the first Pope who refers to them as authorities. Hildebrand, in the eleventh century, was the first to deduce from them that system of papal tyranny in which originated most of the evils of mediæval Christianity.

CHAP.
III.
A.D. 836.

During the troublous period preceding the reign of Alfred the regulars or monastic clergy had almost vanished from the land. When order was restored, many of the religious houses became the habitation of a clergy who did not acknowledge the Benedictine rule, and some of whom were married men. Against such laxity of discipline strict religionists raised¹ an outcry. The Church was soon divided between two

Conflict
between
regulars
and secu-
lars.

¹ The same anomaly had vexed the divines assembled at Cloveshoo in 747. "It is necessary for bishops to go to monasteries, if they can be called monasteries which in these times cannot be in any wise reformed according to the model of Christianity, . . . which are, we know not how, possessed by secular men."—Conc. Cloves., can. 5. Spelm. i. 247.

CHAP.

III.

A.D. 900-
950.

parties, the secular and the monastic. Supported by the approval of Rome, the monastic party not only recovered their just rights, but began to intrench upon those of the seculars. An attempt was made to oust the seculars—especially such as had married—from the cathedral chapters, even from the livings. The antagonism between the two kinds of religionists, we may here remark, was a continual source of disturbance until the Reformation. The regulars were always backed up by the papal see, which, by alienating them from their compatriots and exempting them from episcopal control, used them as tools to weaken the influence of the national Church. Two successive primates in the tenth century warmly supported the cause of the regulars.

Little is known of the earlier English monasteries—so little that, though the Benedictine rule was certainly known in England shortly after the primacy of Theodore, its introduction has often been attributed to Odo and Dunstan.¹ The task of these distinguished ecclesiastics was really perhaps one more arduous—that of re-establishing a system which had been secularized and sapped, and extending it beyond its legitimate sphere. Odo was of Danish blood and heathen parentage. Before his translation to Canterbury he appears to have filled the see of Ramsbury. It was probably at his friend Dunstan's instigation that he proceeded, before his promotion, to the celebrated Benedictine establishment at Fleury,² and returned a monk. For-
saking the party of the secular clergy, to which he had hitherto belonged, he thus "expressed his opinion that no one was fit to be an archbishop unless he had

Odo.

A.D. 942.

¹ Dunstan is called "*Pater monachorum et sidus Anglorum*."—Brompton X., Script. 877.

² *Ibid.*, 863.

first become a monk—one of the religious.”¹ Three great measures of reform monopolized this primate’s thoughts, and were executed with pitiless assiduity—the enforcement of the Benedictine rule in all monasteries; the separation of the married clergy from their wives; and the expulsion of the secular clergy from the cathedral chapters. To Odo’s canons, prohibiting marriage within certain degrees, King Edwy was obliged to submit. The archbishop’s retinue forced the queen, Elgiva, from his palace, and, lest her beauty should weaken his resolution, branded her on the face. Despite or in consequence of such acts of brutality, the archbishop was known to monastic historians as “Odo the Good.”² Contemporaries gave him the less flattering epithet, “Odo Severus.” Dunstan, the friend and successor of Odo, was more gentle in temper and infinitely superior in talent. A statesman as well as an ecclesiastic, his influence in the secular history of his time may be compared to that of Wolsey or Richelieu in subsequent ages. Born of good parentage, Dunstan was educated in a noted monastery at Glastonbury. Here, according to his monkish biographers, youthful visions predicted to him his future task of restoring the Benedictine discipline. His introduction to the court of Athelstan was succeeded by an enjoyment of royal favour which provoked jealousy. His enemies accused him of proficiency in magic, and he was ignominiously expelled from the royal presence. Disappointment and illness led him to Fleury, whence he returned an ardent champion of the Benedictine system. He persuaded Edmund to endow a Benedictine monastery at Glastonbury after the model of Fleury, where he himself presided as abbot. Without

CHAP.
III.

Dunstan.
A.D. 959.

¹ Hook, *Archbishops*, vol. i., “Odo.”

² See *Malmesb. Script.* post Bed., 115.

CHAP.

III.

resigning this office, he became bishop both of Worcester and London. Edwy and the anti-monastic party were unable to exclude him from the secular administration; and, with Odo at Canterbury, Dunstan was already the guiding spirit in ecclesiastical matters. The deaths of Odo and Edwy were almost contemporaneous. Edgar at once installed Dunstan at Canterbury (959). The work which Odo had initiated was now brought to a successful conclusion. No less than forty-seven monasteries were founded, chiefly at the expense of the secular clergy. The cathedral chapters were purged, and stocked with regulars. Oswald Bishop of Worcester, and Ethelwold Bishop of Winchester, warmly supported this innovation; and the royal guarantee for effecting it was known as "Oswald's Law." The opposition of the defrauded canons was violent, but when they clamoured for redress at Winchester, Dunstan contrived that the crucifix should utter a voice of protest,¹ "*Absit hoc ut fiat.*" By a similar imposture he awed his opponents at a Council at Calne. In a primacy which considerably sapped the independence of the English Church it is pleasant to witness one instance of resistance to the papal mandates. An earl whom Dunstan had excommunicated for an incestuous marriage obtained letters from Rome commanding Dunstan to grant absolution. The archbishop flatly refused compliance till the sin should be forsaken and penitence expressed.²

Elfric the
homilist.

To the same century as Dunstan probably belongs the great Saxon homilist Elfric, a voluminous writer, of uncertain date. To Elfric are ascribed translations of several portions of the Scriptures, eighty homilies,

¹ Osbern, *De Vit. S. Dunst.*, Angl. Sacr., ii. 112; cf. Spelm., *Conc.*, ii. 490.

² See Hook, *Archbishops*, vol. i. p. 408.

a book of ecclesiastical laws and canons, and some hortatory epistles. Much importance is attached to these works, as illustrating the usages of the Church in England at the close of the Saxon period. The canons enumerate seven orders of clergy, viz. the *ostiary* or sexton, the *exorcist*, the *lector* who read the lessons in church, the *acolyth*, the *subdeacon* who performed subordinate functions at mass, the *deacon*, and the *priest*. Bishops and archbishops were regarded as leading members of the priestly order. Elfric directs that consecrated oil should be sprinkled on infants at baptism, and on sick persons *in extremis*. He insists on the celibacy of the clergy, and attaches much weight to acts of penance and to the intercession of saints. Bede had considered purgatory a thing only not incredible; Elfric appears to have believed in purgatory as efficacious for the cleansing of less perfect souls. As we have before remarked, Elfric is decidedly opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation.¹ Perhaps it is on this ground that the historians of the Anglo-Norman period, Osbern and William of Malmesbury, tell us so little of the learned homilist. That he was an abbot and a bishop is gathered from his works, but neither his abbey nor his see can be identified. An Elfric succeeded to the see of Canterbury in A.D. 995; another Elfric was appointed by Canute to the see of York in A.D. 1025. Dr. Hook decides that the former is the author of the homilies.

The succeeding reigns contribute little material to the Church history of the Anglo-Saxon period. The vitality of English Christianity is illustrated by the conversion of Canute the Dane from a life of brutality (1017). This occurred soon after his accession. His

Canute.

A.D. 1017.

¹ See the Paschal Homily.

CHAP.
III.

reign was marked by numerous acts of piety and beneficence. A liberal supporter of the parochial clergy, as well as of the regulars, Canute contrived to allay for a time the mutual jealousies of the two rival factions. A dangerous precedent was, however, established in this reign by the monarch assuming to himself the right of electing bishops. Hitherto the clergy and people had shared this right; the king had recommended the candidate, but this recommendation was not necessarily construed as an order. From this reign, too, the royal investiture of bishops by means of ring and crosier—the practice so offensive to the clergy of the Anglo-Norman period—is said to date.

Edward
the Con-
fessor
A.D. 1043.

Edward the Confessor is extolled by monkish writers on account of his preference for the celibate state. There is really little to admire in his character; and his unpatriotic policy undoubtedly paved the way for the Norman invasion and the miseries resulting therefrom. So hateful to Saxon England was the sight of a court and a Church in which the highest places were monopolized by Normans, that Edward's subjects rose in revolt to expel Archbishop Robert and other dignitaries of foreign extraction. Stigand, Bishop of Winchester, was appointed by the Witan to the primacy; and the papal mandates ordering the reinstatement of Robert were disregarded. After the battle of Hastings Stigand anointed Edgar Atheling as king. William appears to have made overtures to the last Saxon primate; but Stigand clung to that party of irreconcilables of which Hereward was the champion. Stigand's appointment had from the first been a grief to Rome. In 1070 the patriot prelates were deposed by a papal order.

Before we close this chapter, we must remind the

reader that the history of the Anglo-Saxon Church, of which we have given only a compendium, can be rightly studied only in view of the history of Western Christianity. The period intervening between Augustine's mission and the invasion of William of Normandy happens to synchronize with one of the great divisions in the history of Western Christendom. The tendencies of this historical period will explain more especially the relations of Saxon Christianity and the Papacy. The most noticeable feature in these five centuries is the adoption by Christianity of the centralizing system of Roman imperialism. As far back as the middle of the fifth century, Leo I. had asserted the supremacy of the Roman bishop as the successor of S. Peter. After the brilliant career of Gregory the Great, this supremacy became the leading idea of the Popes; and the Papacy at length assumed that relation to the converted which Roman imperialism had borne to the conquered. Episcopal prerogatives were gradually concentrated in the person of the Pope; and the system of ecclesiastical polity was yet further narrowed when the nomination to the papal chair was declared to be vested in the body of cardinals. Similarly, clerical prerogatives everywhere became centred in the bishoprics and monasteries; and the parochial clergy gradually ceased to have any voice in the management of Church affairs. Before the end of this period the independence of the Church was sapped by the system of which the forged Decretals are the exponent. Pernicious in its consequences, it must be admitted that the centralizing system at first sight appears to be the system best suited to the age. Civilizing influences were thus radiated simultaneously throughout an obedient Christendom; and religious unity—a principle

CHAP.

III.

A glance at
Church
history
abroad.

Progress of
the central-
izing sys-
tem.

Its advan-
tages.

CHAP.
III.

which the uneducated seldom appreciate spontaneously—was authoritatively maintained. Justice, when denied by local ignorance and prejudice, was sought at the Roman court of appeal, and not so vainly as in the age succeeding. “During this period,” says an impartial writer, “the decisions of Rome—be it said to her credit—were mostly just and in the interests of morality.” Moreover, the Church was enabled to contend successfully against slavery; against the debasing practice—as yet disowned by Christendom—of expiating crimes by money payment; against neglect of the needy and oppressed; and against that rough and hasty resentment of injury which barbarians mistake for justice. Vice in high places received the rebuke or the punishment which under other systems it would have escaped. Attempts were made to discountenance warfare; and such pacts as the “Truce of God” attest the salutary influence of the Church on a rough and petulant generation.

The period
closes on a
harmoni-
ous state
of things.

Unity throughout this period, as we have already shown, kept out of men’s minds the now familiar distinction between Church and State. In the sphere of politics the Anglo-Saxon bishop was an eorl, improved by the influences of culture, learning, and religious aspirations. He sat as a judge in the hundred court; had special jurisdiction in suits concerning public morality; and was often the king’s chief minister. On the other hand, the king, who not unfrequently ended his life in a monastery, took a leading part in the ordering of matters ecclesiastical. His rights in appointing to vacant bishoprics have been mentioned. He convened synods, wherein laws both civil and ecclesiastical were passed, and was even present at councils of a strictly ecclesiastical character. To him

and his nobles belonged extensive rights of patronage, the rule being that founders of endowed churches bequeathed to their heirs the right of appointing the incumbents.

CHAP.

III.

It will be seen in the next chapter how the harmony subsisting between the powers lay and ecclesiastical was rudely shaken amid the contentions of tyrannical sovereigns and pretentious Popes;—how the secular and spiritual courts were first separated and then estranged;—how the term “religion” was monopolized by the monks, who affected as great a disdain for the secular clergy as for the laity;—how the monks encroached on the prerogatives of the bishops, and were encouraged by the Popes to do so;—how Hildebrand and Innocent III. taught the Anglican Church to view Rome with jealous suspicion, and thus paved the way for the anti-papal statutes of the succeeding period, and for the revolutionary movements of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Which is completely transformed in the age ensuing.

CHAPTER IV.

Anglo-Norman Period.

A.D. 1066-1216.

Contrasted with the period preceding—Alienation of temporal and spiritual powers—The Churchmen fight for constitutional government—Liberties of the Church recognized—Guaranteed again in the succeeding period—The Church the stronghold of Anglo-Saxon patriotism—William's harsh ecclesiastical laws—The conflict also attributable to papal influence—Hildebrand—Roman "mediation"—A means of establishing temporal pretensions—The conflict often misinterpreted—Chief points at issue—William's dealings with the Church—Lanfranc—Feudal tenure of bishops—Canons and papal sentences dependent on royal pleasure—Separation of civil and ecclesiastical courts—William's conquest Rome's conquest—But William sometimes resists papal pretension—William compared with Henry VIII.—Church reforms offensive to the English—Norman influence in many respects salutary—Vain attempts to enforce clerical celibacy—Anselm and William Rufus—The confiscation grievance—Anselm and Henry I.—The investiture grievance—Rome always the real gainer—Becket and Henry II.—How are clergy to be tried?—Career of Becket—Forced to head the opposition—Council of Westminster—Constitutions of Clarendon—Becket's party the champions of constitutional government—The six years' contest—Decision of the question—Treatment of heresy—The Publicani in England—Heretics on the Continent—Monasticism in the ascendant—The primate appointed by monks—The Pope appoints Langton—John wages war with the Church—This ends in a disgraceful surrender to the Pope—The Charter offensive to Rome—The crown offered to Louis—Survey of general history—Innocent III.

Contrasted
with the
period pre-
ceding.

DURING the Anglo-Saxon period the relations of the Church to the State were seldom other than friendly. Religion and politics, ecclesiastical and secular influences, were so interwrought in the fabric of the constitution as to be almost inseparable. The Anglo-Norman period, on the contrary, is characterized by conflicts almost continuous between the high powers of Church and State, notably between the primate and the king.

The Conqueror deposes Stigand; Rufus and Henry I. are at issue with Anselm, Henry II. with Becket, John with Langton. The representatives of foreign tyranny press home the harsh ecclesiastical laws of William I.; the prelates of the national Church clamour for the liberties guaranteed to Churchman and commoner by the Anglo-Saxon constitution. The people are invariably on the side of the Church, the Norman barons on that of the throne. The regulars, who have swarmed into England in the wake of the foreign dynasty, and under the patronage of the Pope, are themselves encroaching on the prerogatives of the Churchmen; their sympathies and interests are naturally on the side of foreign aggression. Gradually, as the conquered and conquering races blend, the interests of the royal retainers are identified with those of the English people; the barons become infected with the national spirit, they catch up the Churchmen's cry of liberty; there is a struggle, in which the sovereign fights single-handed, or with no ally but the Pope; the issue is the enlargement of the subject's rights, and the limitation of royal prerogative by the admission of representative Houses to a share in the administration.

CHAP.
IV.

Alienation
of temporal
and
spiritual
powers.

The
Churchmen
fight for
constitu-
tional
govern-
ment.

The estate which had borne the brunt of the battle was rewarded, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, by John's admission that the "holy Church of God is a free Church," not to be "sold or farmed out" at the pleasure of the sovereign. In the succeeding period we shall find repeated attempts to secure the immunities of the Church against Pope and sovereign by protective statutes, preparing men's minds for the acceptance of a body, self-governing, molested and despoiled neither by king nor pontiff. Part of this ideal was realized when Henry VIII., to

Liberties
of the
Church
recognized.

CHAP.
IV.

Guaran-
teed again
in the suc-
ceeding
period.

the gratification of nearly all the secular clergy, crowned the work of the patriotic statesmen of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries by an absolute renunciation of Roman supremacy. But the avarice of the Tudors, the personal pretensions of the Stuarts, and the jealousies resulting from the great constitutional catastrophes of the seventeenth century postponed its fuller realization, and the present relation of the Church to Government can hardly be considered a final settlement of the question.¹

The Church
the strong-
hold of
Anglo-
Saxon
patriotism.

The conflict between the secular and spiritual powers during the Anglo-Norman period was to some extent a political necessity. The Church was the recognized stronghold of Anglo-Saxon patriotism. Peculiarly independent of continental influences even in the reign of the degenerate Edward the Confessor, the clergy resisted the usurpation of William long after the less patriotic nobility had succumbed; when forced to accept the Norman dynasty, they obstinately opposed the religious innovations of the invading race. William found it necessary to depose the native prelates, and to place the Church under the control of a foreigner, willing and able to curb this spirit of independence—Lanfranc, Abbot of Bec.

William's
harsh
ecclesiasti-
cal laws.

The Conqueror's legislation betrays the aim of making the priesthood an unpopular *caste*, alienated from sympathy by severance from public life, and deterred from disloyalty to the throne by liability to oppressive statutes. This policy overreached itself. The restrictions on the clergy and their exemption from the privileges and liabilities of ordinary citizens caused continual

¹ Churchmen may reasonably complain that one estate of the realm has secured self-government at the expense of the other, that the Church's representative body is a *vox et præterea nihil*, and that Christianity and common sense are alike outraged when a Government of any or no religion is empowered to legislate for (or against) the Church.

entanglements under the Conqueror's hot-headed successors, and in every dispute between king and Churchman the latter, regarded as the champion of national liberties, commanded the sympathies of the lower orders.

But it is not only to antipathy of race, nor to oppressive legislation, that this conflict is to be ascribed. With the Norman dynasty there entered England the influence of a court, here hitherto inappreciable as a political force;—a court which, jealous alike of throne and national Church, loved to enhance its own importance by setting the two at variance. We have alluded to the dissemination of the False Decretals, and the influence of that publication in establishing the pretensions of the Papacy. Contemporary with William lived the great Hildebrand, raised to the pontifical chair as Gregory VII. in 1073. The object of this man's life was to reform Europe by the extension of the powers accredited by the Decretals. The Pope was to be, according to Hildebrand's theory, the recognized umpire in all disputes, whose arbitration should anticipate the millennium and put an end to warfare and injustice. But to be able to act as universal arbiter, the pontiff must be recognized by all prelates, princes, and kings, as their suzerain or liege lord. The triumph of this well-meaning but short-sighted reformer over the Emperor Henry IV. convinced a generation, which received the False Decretals unquestioningly, of the feasibility of the scheme. Less conscientious successors reasserted the pretensions of Gregory VII. from more questionable motives. Kings and prelates were encouraged to make appeals to Rome, and accompany their appeals by bribes. Disregard of the papal verdict might entail the fearful sentence of an excommunication or interdict. The interposition of a power whose

The conflict
also attri-
butable
to papal
influence.

Hilde-
brand.

CHAP.
IV.

interest it was to set Church and State at variance widened the rupture which severed the Anglo-Norman dynasty from the clergy of England. The policy of Rome everywhere throughout this period was to engender and embitter strifes between Churchmen and sovereigns as to questions of clerical prerogative, so as to bring both parties as appellants to the papal court. The policy of William and his immediate successors was, as we have seen, one of undisguised hostility towards the English Churchmen. England therefore during this period was a fruitful source of revenue to the court of appeal.

Roman
"mediation."

The response of the oracle was seldom directly favourable to the ecclesiastics. The successor of S. Peter usually took care that other episcopates should not be unduly exalted; and Canterbury, the patriarchate of the extreme West, appears to have been honoured with special jealousy. An appeal from a monastic house against the English episcopate almost invariably resulted in a verdict for the appellant; and the regulars were thus encouraged to consider themselves dependent on Rome alone. On the other hand, the dynasty which had introduced the custom of appealing to Rome received great boons from the Pope; but for every boon a price was paid by the establishment of a precedent derogating from the honour of the crown. The climax was reached during the conflict of King John with the barons lay and spiritual, when the payment due for the sanction given to the Norman Conquest and for other papal favours was at last discharged by a royal acknowledgment that England was a fief of Rome.

A means of
establish-
ing tempo-
ral preten-
sions.

The con-
flict often
misinter-
preted.

From party historians the conflict of the Anglo-Norman period has received a religious colouring. The

party which happened to fare ill at Rome is invested with the sentiments of Edward VI.'s Reformers. Or the clergy are presumed to be fighting on the side of Romanism against rulers of anti-papal proclivities. The student is warned against such misrepresentations of a struggle, which was, in fact, rather political than religious. As regards the Pope, the only doubtful question was, What were the limits of his jurisdiction? His spiritual supremacy was admitted by all: kings, barons, bishops, and monks were so far of one mind. The powers of interference involved in this supremacy were undefinable. Hence men exaggerated or curtailed them just as their personal interests chanced to be affected. But to aggrandize a foreign despot was as little the settled policy of the clergy as of the sovereign.

As regards the Church, the conflict bore on the political position of the estate whose liberties had been most injured by the Norman Conquest. Was the king to be allowed to plunder vacant sees? Did the religious character of his office permit a newly appointed bishop to do homage for his temporalities in the same way as a lay baron? The Churchmen being excluded from the county courts, who was to guarantee that a baron might not murder a cleric with impunity, or, on the other hand, that a clerical offender would be tried impartially in the ecclesiastical courts? What, again, were the respective rights of the sovereign and the suffragan bishops in the election of a metropolitan?

Chap.
points at
issue.

Such were some of the issues necessarily raised by William's limitation of clerical liberties.

We now proceed to a detailed account of this stormy period in the history of our Church. Archbishop Stigand and three bishops were deposed by

William's
dealings
with the
Church.

CHAP.
IV.

A.D. 1070.

Lanfranc.

Feudal
tenure of
bishops.Canons and
papal sen-
tences
dependent
on royal
pleasure.William's
conquest
Rome's
conquest.

William as hopelessly disaffected to the new dynasty; and many of the leading Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastics fled the country after the battle of Hastings. The interests of the Norman ecclesiastics who filled the episcopates thus vacated were so linked with those of the Conqueror, that they readily accepted the harsh statutes devised to suppress the native clergy. William's first proceeding after the appointment of Lanfranc (1070) was to reduce the episcopate to a state of vassalage. In Saxon times the bishops had held their lands under the tenure of frankalmoign or free alms. This was now altered to tenure by barony, involving the usual feudal obligations. In view of the possible disloyalty of the new vassals, the king ruled that no Church Council should pass canons disagreeable to himself. Malcontents would probably follow the royal example of enlisting the good offices of the Pope; therefore no letters from Rome should enter the country till approved of by the king; nor should the aggrieved ecclesiastics have liberty to quit England. It sometimes happened at this period that there was more than one claimant to the Papacy; the English ecclesiastics were forbidden to recognize any Pope but the king's Pope. Hitherto the bishop and ealdorman had together dispensed justice in the county court. Henceforward there were to be two courts, the civil and the ecclesiastical. Cases in which clerks were concerned were to be tried in the latter. But no bishop was to implead or excommunicate any of the king's vassals, even for the grossest offences, without the consent of the king.¹

Pope Alexander II. had hallowed William's expedition with the contribution of a consecrated banner.

¹ Blackstone, Book I. c. 2; Seldeni notæ ad Eadm., 104.

The conquest of England was justly regarded at Rome as effecting the affiliation of a Church hitherto severed from papal influences. The Conqueror perhaps considered that this gain to the Papacy was sufficient requital for Alexander's patronage. He was visited by a papal legate, demanding homage to Gregory VII. as suzerain of all the powers of Europe, and complaining of the non-payment of Peter's pence. Admitting the indebtedness of the kingdom in the latter respect,¹ William let the Pope plainly understand that the claim to homage which he had established in other countries would not be recognized by the sovereign of England. "Homage to thee," he replies, "I have not chosen, neither do I choose to do. I never made a promise to that effect; neither do I find that it was ever promised by my predecessors to thine."² Archbishop Lanfranc imitated the policy of his patron. It is true that he obeyed a papal summons to Rome, when, without compliance, he could not secure the pall. But at a later time he completely disregarded a papal letter, desiring him to visit Rome "for the confirmation of the faith and of the Christian religion," under pain of suspension. The policy of William with regard to Rome was, in short, that afterwards adopted by Henry VIII. He was the obsequious servant of the Pope as long as the Pope could be of service; his object gained, he preferred to be "supreme head" himself. Lanfranc abetted this policy, and sacrificed the liberties of his

CHAP.

IV.

But William sometimes resists papal pre-tension.

William compared with Henry VIII.

¹ Which, as Dean Hook observes, was more than he need have conceded. For the tax had hitherto not been levied on the kingdom, but only on the private estates of the king, and was paid, not as a tribute to the Pope, but as a fund for the sustentation of the English college at Rome. Of these facts the Conqueror was doubtless ignorant. It may be noticed here that the payment of Peter's pence continued from this reign till that of Edward III., when it was prohibited. It was abrogated by statute 23 Hen. VIII. c. 21, to be re-established by statute 1 & 3 Philip and Mary, c. 8, and finally abrogated by statute 1 Eliz. c. 1.

² Opp. Lanfr., i., cf. 10.

CHAP.

IV.

Church
reforms
offensive
to the
English.

clerical brethren with Cranmer-like complaisance. The obligations of the new dynasty were, however, kept in remembrance by S. Peter's representatives. The debt which the strong-willed Conqueror could ignore with impunity was exacted with interest from weaker or less politic successors.

The rule of Lanfranc and the Norman prelates was, of course, ungrateful to the native clergy. The monastic bodies, which had been filled with foreigners by King Edward, were less hostile to the new system. The Norman bishops, however, in the enforcement of reforms, acted with perfect indifference to the prejudices of the Church upon which they had been foisted. They deprived small Anglo-Saxon saints of their posthumous honours;¹ they transferred the sites of ancient cathedrals to cities of greater importance;² they silenced the old Gregorian chants in favour of a new system of music devised by William of Fescamp.³ Monasticism was developed—too often at the expense of the parish churches; and the “secular” clergy were finally swept from all the cathedrals. These remained monastic till the time of the Reformation. The innovations were so far distasteful to the regulars that they involved the introduction of new orders of monks. With the Conquest came the Canons Regular of S. Augustine; the Cluniac and Carthusian orders shortly

¹ This, of course, was done to deprive Anglo-Saxon patriotism of a religious stimulus. It is curious to read that the *idolatrous* tendency of such devotion was Lanfranc's alleged pretext in punishing Wulfhetel, the Abbot of Croyland, where people flocked to see the wonder-working shrine of Waltheof. See Florence of Worcester; Matthew of Paris; Ordericus Vitalis, iv. c. 17.

² The Council of London (1075) ruled that the see of Sherborne should be removed to Sarum, that of Selsey to Chichester, and that of Lichfield to Chester. The see of Lincoln took the place of Dorchester in 1085; the see of Elmham was transferred first to Thetford (1078), and finally to Norwich (1101).

³ For the account of this innovation at Glastonbury and the consequent insurrection of the monks, see Florence of Worcester, ad ann. 1083.

followed; the close of the century witnessed the institution of the order of Citeaux or Cistercium, destined to become the most popular of all. Already the rival houses in many places impaired the prestige of old foundations. At Canterbury the ancient monastery of S. Augustine's¹ had not only to endure the presence of a new Benedictine establishment, substituted for the secular cathedral chapter—the primate forced upon them an abbot of his own choosing, and severely punished some brethren who ventured to resist² (1089).

Offensive as such high-handed proceedings were to Anglo-Saxon patriotism, it was soon manifest how greatly the Church had gained by the infusion of the Norman element. With the Normans came architectural science, which, if it built castles for the suppression of the insubordinate, provided for the devout churches and cathedrals surpassing³ the highest conceptions of Saxon genius. By giving the Church a more elaborate organization, Lanfranc allayed ancient jealousies and provided for the establishment of orderly administration. The Archbishop of Canterbury claimed to be primate, not of England, but of “the British Isles”—a claim he could vindicate by telling how Patrick, Archbishop of Dublin, had tendered to him the oath of canonical obedience. York was declared to be distinctly subordinate to Canterbury,⁴ an arrangement

Norman influence in many respects salutary.

¹ The first in rank of the English religious houses; and in Western Christendom ranking as second only to Monte Cassino. See Robertson, vol. v. 395.

² See the account in Hook's *Archbishops*, vol. i. pp. 159, 160.

³ The new Cathedral at Canterbury was begun by Lanfranc shortly after the Conquest. Rochester cathedral dates from 1077; Chichester was begun in the same year. Durham belongs to the reign of William II., as also Norwich and Winchester. More than three hundred monasteries were built between the years 1100 and 1200.

⁴ The northern primate was to go for consecration to Canterbury, or wherever the Archbishop of Canterbury should direct. Thomas of York had to succumb before Lanfranc; but he gave trouble again in the time of Anselm.

CHAP.

IV.

which the northern metropolitans tardily accepted.¹ Winchester was to rank next to York, London next to Winchester. Hitherto there had been diversity of ritual in the various episcopates, even in the different abbeys. At Glastonbury, the enforcement of the new Norman chants in the place of Gregorians had resulted in an insurrection of the monks. It was, perhaps, this episode which prompted the subsequent measures for establishing uniformity. To prevent the recurrence of such a scandal in his diocese, Osmund, the Bishop of Sarum, composed a "custom book" to be used by all his clergy. The production was of singular merit, and won Lanfranc's approval. Under the name of the "Use of Sarum" it gradually penetrated every diocese. The "Use of Sarum" survives, expurgated and supplemented, in our Book of Common Prayer. By the Romanists of Mary's time, this national Use was exchanged for the Roman breviary of the continent.³

Cir. A.D.
1090.

Vain
attempt
to enforce
clerical
celibacy.

The national Churches of the Continent had all been affected by Gregory's vigorous warfare against simoniacal contracts for benefices, and clerical marriages, considered the two crying evils of the day. His sentiments so far influenced England that a synod held at Winchester in 1076 enacted that no married man should be ordained, and that no priest or deacon might be allowed to marry.² It has already been pointed out that before Dunstan's time marriage was rather the rule than the exception with the English clergy. After Dunstan, celibacy was the law even for the parochial priests, but was pretty generally evaded. The censures

¹ See p. 37, note.

² The title of the Roman Service Book used in England is, as Dean Hook points out, "*Ordo administrandi Sacramenta, etc., in missione Anglicana ex Rituali Romano jussu Pauli V. edito extractus; nonnullis adjutis ex antiquo Rituali Anglicano.*"—Foxe's *Romish Rites*, p. 256.

³ Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 307.

of this synod and many succeeding synods effected little change of practice. In Anselm's time the Pope admitted that clergymen's sons formed "the greatest and best part of the priesthood," and this was probably equally true a hundred years later, when Fitzjocelyn, a clergyman's son, became primate. John could find no more effective method of punishing the London clergy than imprisonment of their *focariæ*. And down to the time of the Reformation married priests and sons of priests often filled the highest places in the Church.

Lanfranc was succeeded by Anselm, a more typical eleventh-century ecclesiastic, who secured the goodwill of clergy and populace by resisting regal aggression jealously and persistently, if not always discreetly. For nearly four years William Rufus had kept the archbishopric vacant and appropriated its emoluments, and he was dealing in the same way with many other pieces of preferment. At one time this king appears to have pocketed the revenues of three bishoprics and thirteen abbeys. Frightened by illness, he pressed the primacy on Anselm. The latter accepted it on condition the wrongs of the Church were redressed. The continuance of confiscations and exactions led to an open rupture between the king and the new archbishop. The Conqueror's ecclesiastical laws were now used by Rufus as a means of annoying his censor. A pall had to be procured from Rome for the metropolitan. But there were two rival claimants to the Papacy. Rufus for a time pretended not to recognize Urban as pontiff. Then he tried by finessing with Urban's legate to constitute himself the bestower of the pall. When the pall was at length obtained, Anselm desired leave to journey to Rome on business. The business probably included a very evil report of his sovereign's

CHAP.
IV.

Anselm
and W'il-
liam Rufus.

A.D. 1093.

The con-
fiscation
grievance.

CHAP.
IV.

proceedings. "Let him know for certain," replied Rufus, "that if he goes I shall take possession of the archbishopric, and never receive him in the capacity of archbishop again." The words were fulfilled. Anselm went to Rome, and remained abroad for three years, when he received tidings of the tyrant's death. His successor entreated the primate to return, promising that he would not repeat the misdeeds of Rufus, but would govern the Church according to the laws of King Edward. Anselm returned, but it was only to become embroiled with Henry on the great "investiture" question.

Anselm
and
Henry I.

Under Canute England had accepted the old continental¹ rule that the sovereign should invest ecclesiastics with the temporalities of their benefices by the transfer of certain symbols. Those used in the case of a bishop were at this time a staff and ring. On the establishment of the feudal system, the church everywhere began to look upon this ancient ceremony with suspicion. It was thought that its continuance made the Church too dependent on the sovereign. The staff and ring, moreover, symbolized to some extent the spiritual powers of the episcopate. It was argued that, inasmuch as these were not derived from earthly sovereignties, such investiture was misleading. The controversy was one of the kind that it was Roman policy to embitter. In the pontificate of Gregory VII., a synod at Rome forbade prelates to accept the insidious symbols of investiture, or do any act of homage for preferment (February, 1075). Anselm, who seems not to have heard of the controversy till he went to Rome, professed himself unable to do homage to Henry I., and refused to consecrate the bishops whom the king had invested.

¹ See Mosheim, *Inst. Hist. Eccl.*

Henry in a fury vowed that no one should remain in the kingdom who refused to do homage to his suzerain. Rome was appealed to by both sides, and by Henry bribed. The papal trumpet consequently gave an uncertain sound. The dispute was eventually settled in an English Council (1107). A compromise was then effected. The Churchmen consented to do homage for their temporalities, and the sovereign gave up all claim to investiture.¹ By the Concordat of Worms, in 1122, a somewhat similar agreement² was concluded between Pope Calixtus II. and the Emperor Henry V. A.D. 1101.

At this time the national Churches were persuaded that every metropolitan must obtain the pall from Rome. This was usually conveyed by a papal legate, though sometimes, as in the case of Lanfranc, the metropolitan had to journey to Rome to fetch it. The next step in the policy of interference was to obtrude uninvited legates, who summoned and presided at national synods to the detriment of archiepiscopal dignity. One such attempt Anselm experienced, and boldly resisted. A weaker primate, William of Corbeil, suffered a papal legate, John of Crema, to convene a Council at Westminster, wherein he took precedence of the episcopate and nobility (1125). The monk Gervas describes this as "a sight hitherto unknown in the realm of England," which "put the whole kingdom into no small state of indignation."³ Stephen's doubtful title rendered him the servile dependent of Pope Innocent II.⁴ In this reign Alberic, Bishop of Ostia, visited England as papal legate, inspected the monasteries and colleges, convened a synod at Westminster (December, 1138), and, disregarding national custom, Rome always the real gainer.

A.D. 1125.

¹ Spelman, ii. 26 ; Wilkins, i. 387.² Gervas, Chron., 1663.³ See Robertson, History, vol. v. p. 26.⁴ See *Ibid.*, 1346, 1347.

CHAP.
IV.

insisted that the king had no voice in the appointment of the primate. True to its principle of meting out humiliation to sovereigns and metropolitans in equal proportion, the Roman court in the next year appointed William of Winchester its legate, thus empowering the suffragan bishop to take precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

A.D. 1154.

Becket and
Henry II.

Henry II. came to the throne under the pontificate of Nicholas Breakspear (Adrian IV.), the only Englishman that has ever occupied the papal see. When the king proposed to invade Ireland, he followed the example of his great-grandfather, and asked Adrian to sanction the expedition. The Pope saddled his benediction with a proviso that the conquered island should pay Peter's pence, "since all the islands which are enlightened by Christ are unquestionably Peter's right." The great episode of this reign, the conflict between Henry and Becket, is of that kind which elicits undivided sympathy only in men of strong party feeling. Each faction appears to have had a good cause and grievously disgraced it. It will be remembered that the Conqueror had tried to make the Churchmen a caste alienated from popular sympathy, and unable to appear in the civil courts of law. The system thus established was soon found to be unsatisfactory to right-thinking men of all parties. On the one hand, injured Churchmen could not obtain adequate redress, since the ecclesiastical court was not able to enforce its judgments. The murderer of a clergyman thus frequently escaped all penalties save excommunication, and the clergy were worse off, as a contemporary writer puts it, than "Jews or laymen of the lowest grade."¹ On the other hand, clerical offenders some-

¹ Letter of Archbishop Richard, quoted by Dean Hook, *Archbishops*, vol. ii.

times escaped easily, since the canon law inflicted on them no severer penalty than stripes. Henry's judges represented that gross crime had frequently escaped proper cognizance in the ecclesiastical courts. The difficulty would have been speedily settled but for the touchiness of Becket.

CHAP.
IV.

How are
clergy to
be tried?

Thomas Becket, a Londoner of Norman parentage, had been employed by Archbishop Theobald in important diplomatic service, and had been rewarded, after the fashion of the times, with sundry Church preferments, including the lucrative archdeaconry of Canterbury. On the accession of Henry II. he was recommended by Theobald to royal notice, and became the king's chancellor—an office in reality, though not in rank, the highest in the kingdom. In this capacity he served the country well. He is credited with the questionable distinction of being founder of our present Court of Chancery, and he secured contemporary admiration by his zeal and personal courage in the Toulouse campaign. As ambassador to France Becket created a sensation by his magnificence, and his tastes were naturally luxurious. But the attempts to represent him as at this time a boon companion of the king, intemperate and licentious, have no better origin than party malevolence. The interests of the court and the Church were at this time considered almost essentially antagonistic. The chancellor was on the king's side in every matter of dispute, and was regarded by the

Career of
Becket.

p. 517. The Churchmen's view of the subject has been so generally misrepresented that it will be instructive to cite some passages at length. "If a Jew or a layman of the lowest grade be killed, the murderer is immediately sentenced to the punishment of death; whereas if any one has killed a priest or clergyman of the lower or higher order, the Church, contented with excommunication, or I should rather say *contemned* through it, refuses the aid of the carnal weapon. . . . Murderers of a clergyman or a bishop are sent to Rome; they go in mere jest with the plenitude of the Apostolic favour, and return to commit crime again with greater audacity."

CHAP.

IV.

A.D. 1162.

Forced to
head the
opposition.Council of
West-
minster.Constitu-
tions of
Clarendon.
A D. 1164.

ecclesiastics as a persecutor of holy Church. This was the man whom Henry insisted on raising, on the strength of his deacon's orders, to the highest post in the Anglican Church. The king's wish was to secure an ally instead of an antagonist at Canterbury. Becket, on the other hand,¹ warned the king that his preferment would make him a true ecclesiastic, identified with a party markedly hostile to the court. The prediction fulfilled itself, and primate and king were in their normal position of ill-concealed hostility when the readjustment of the civil and ecclesiastical courts became a matter of public consideration. At a Council at Westminster Henry demanded that a guilty ecclesiastic should be degraded by the bishop, and subsequently punished like a layman by sentence of the civil court. To this arrangement the prelates were prepared to assent. Becket, however, not unreasonably objected that the clerical culprit would thus be twice punished for the same offence; then, assuming a defiant tone, he informed the king that he would not obey any law of the realm that should compromise "the privileges of his order." Henry left the meeting in great wrath,² and summoned a council of barons and Churchmen to the Castle of Clarendon, where the grand justiciary drew up the sixteen articles known as the Constitutions of Clarendon.

The most noticeable enactments in these Constitutions were—that in all civil and criminal causes the clergy should be arraigned in the king's courts; that in ecclesiastical questions appeals should lie from the archbishop to the king; that no archbishop, bishop, or "other exalted person" should leave the kingdom

¹ See the Lives—Herbert of Bosham, vii. 27; Roger of Pontigny, ii. 108.

² Herbert, vii. 109, 110; Roger, ii. 117.

without royal permission; that the revenues of vacant preferments should accrue to the king; that in elections to an archbishopric, bishopric, abbacy, or priory, the king should "recommend the best persons," the subsequent election should be made with the king's consent, and the dignitary elect should do homage to the king for his temporalities.

CHAP.

IV.

It will be observed that the Constitutions are based on William's ecclesiastical statutes. Under the pretext of reforming a recognized abuse, the king aimed at resuscitating that system of personal tyranny which had been recently invalidated by a disputed succession and a civil war. On the other hand, the policy of the Church—the policy of which Becket was now the champion—was to limit the preponderance of the crown by establishing a counterbalance. The Church, enjoying the same freedom as in Anglo-Saxon times, was to act as the people's bulwark against the encroachment of king and barons. The general concessions afterwards defined by Archbishop Langton in Magna Charta were probably included in the political programme of Becket's party. It was desired, in fact, that not only the clerical estate, but every class, should be fairly taxed, tried by its peers, conceded its rights free of purchase, and allowed to pass freely from land to land, save only in times of war. This was just the class of concessions which the Constitutions of Clarendon refused. Hence Becket, the opponent of the Constitutions, became at once the idol of the middle and lower classes, and did in fact give an impulse to the cause of civil liberty, for which he has scarcely received sufficient credit. The characteristic infirmities of the man, his bigotry, petulance, and spiritual pride, have engrossed the attention of writers who might have

Becket's
party the
champions
of constitu-
tional
govern-
ment.

CHAP.

IV.

been expected to do justice to his public position as a demagogue, champion of liberty, and patron saint of the populace.

The six
years' con-
test.
A.D. 1164-
1170.

Becket appears to have been brought to the Council by treachery, and there bullied till he swore to observe the "so-called customs." But he subsequently¹ refused to set seal or signature to these restrictions of ecclesiastical prerogative, and he was absolved by the Pope from his oath. Henry retorted by a preposterous claim on Becket for moneys received during his chancellorship. He wrung from the Pope, now menaced by the pretension of an antipope, a legatine commission for the Archbishop of York, Becket's enemy and would-be rival. He even procured the primate's condemnation for perjury and treason at the Council of Northampton, where Becket's enemies, lay and clerical, heaped on him shameful² indignities. Becket succeeded in making his escape to France. A six years' contest ensued. The king plundered the revenues of Canterbury. Becket from his cell at Pontigny launched excommunications on the whole court faction. Policy still precluded the Pope from espousing Becket's cause. The bishops were many of them on the side of the king—notably York, Salisbury, and London. The stronghold of the exiled primate was the pronounced sympathy of the English people. Inconclusive meetings were held at Bayeux, Caen, and Rouen; all terms of truce were cancelled by Henry's reservation, "Saving the honour of my crown," or by Becket's, "Saving the honour of God." Fresh encroachment was made on the primate's rights. The prince Henry was to be crowned during his father's

¹ See Grim, *Vita*, i. 31; Roger of Pont. i., 127; Gardiner, 72.

² Will. Cant. ii. 13.

lifetime; in defiance of Becket's prerogative the Archbishop of York performed the ceremony. The enraged primate bitterly rebuked the politic Pope, whose connivance at this usurpation had been secured; and himself menaced England with an interdict. Suddenly and informally the controversy appeared to end. A singularly peaceful interview between Henry and Becket took place at Fretville. The primate returned, to be greeted with acclamations by the populace, but with insults and threats of violence from the knights and barons who had divided the archiepiscopal emoluments, and the bishops whom he had excommunicated.¹ He vainly sought redress from the young king at Woodstock. Inspired, however, by his popularity with the lower orders, he proceeded to launch excommunications, not only on the chief offenders, the sacrilegious knights and the contumacious suffragans, but on all such clergy as had been presented to preferment in his diocese during his exile. The leaders of the hostile party sought the king at Bayeux and claimed his protection. Henry's hasty speech, taken too literally by four brutal and obsequious knights, the murder in Canterbury Cathedral (December 29, 1170), and the subsequent penitence of the excommunicate king, are familiar to every reader. It remains to notice that the violent death of Becket practically gave the victory to the supporters of clerical prerogative. To clear himself of complicity in the murder, Henry, in the presence of the papal legates, resigned all customs and usages practised in his time to the prejudice of the Church; and in 1177 he definitely promised the legate Vivian that no clerk should be prosecuted in a secular court for any crime, and that no ecclesiastical revenues should be

Decision
of the
question.

¹ Grim, i. 67; Garnier, 121.

CHAP.

IV.

detained in the king's hands more than a year. On the other hand, Archbishop Richard, Becket's successor, with the view of restoring harmony, conceded to the king the privilege of impeaching offending clerks, and thus removed the only pretext for oppressive legislature. For the rest of his reign Henry appears to have acted towards the Church with justice and wisdom.

Treatment
of heresy.

In the age of which we are treating it was held that the spiritual welfare of the community deserved protection, just as much as its temporal or political welfare. The heretic who propagated his heresy was classed with the murderer and traitor, as an enemy to the State; or, rather, his guilt exceeded theirs in proportion as the soul outvalues the body. This opinion was maintained and acted upon by both the contending parties in the Reformation period; and it was not decidedly discredited till the eighteenth century. In an age in which there was no thought of making punishments other than brutal, the heretic was treated with a severity which excites the compassion of a more enlightened generation. The reign of Henry II. presents us with an instance of this forcible suppression of religious error. A company of German heretics, called Publicani, entered England in 1160, under the leadership of Walter Gerhard. They denounced the use of all sacraments, and endeavoured to propagate an absurd asceticism, prohibiting marriage and the use of animal food and wine. Having turned a deaf ear to persuasion, they were at last sentenced to be publicly whipped, and as it was ordered that no man should give them entertainment, they were fairly starved out of the country. This is said to be the first occasion when punishment for heretical teaching was required in

The Pub-
licani in
England.

A.D. 1160.

England, and only one instance of the capital punishment of heretical or immoral preaching occurs before the reign of Henry IV.

Other nations were not so fortunate in this respect. Almost every continental state was disturbed during the twelfth century by the preaching of sectaries, who, under the pretext of remedying abuses of religion, propounded new systems in which grotesqueness vied with immorality. In this connection the names of Peter de Bruys, Henry, the founder of the Henricians, Arnold of Brescia, and Tanquelm, a kind of twelfth-century Mormonite, may be mentioned. Usually the founder of the sect contrasted favourably with his followers. The heresiarch, sincerely convinced of his crotchet, inveighed against matrimony or preached polygamy, rejected all dogma or devised new dogma, clamoured to enrich himself with ecclesiastical property, or went naked. The followers were for the most part a worthless rabble, who made the shibboleth of their leader a pretext for the gratification of their own lust and avarice. The most notorious among the sects of this time were the heretical Albigenses of Toulouse, said to be a branch of the Bulgarian Cathari, and the Waldenses, or poor men of Lyons.¹ Both these were

¹ The Albigenses appear to have denied the doctrine of the resurrection, discarded all sacraments, and accepted in part the Manichæan teaching of the Cathari, asserting the existence of two First Causes—one good, one evil. Like some later sects, they used a conscientious scruple against taking oaths as a covert for prevarication. Innocent III. ordered a kind of crusade against the Albigenses, and the nobles of France suppressed the sectaries with terrible severity. A few of this persuasion are said to have existed in the sixteenth century and embraced the doctrines of Zuingli. With this sect are often confounded the harmless Waldenses, or poor men of Lyons, who probably derived their origin and name from Peter of Valdum, a town in the marquisate of Lyons. These were a sect of pietists, whose aim it was to prohibit warfare, lawsuits, and all accumulation of wealth. The doctrinal chimeras of the Waldenses are interesting as anticipating those of later sects, and a modern admirer has not unfairly designated them as "premature Protestants." Unable to discern living energy in the religious institutions of

CHAP.

IV.

subjected to persecutions of fearful cruelty, and the Albigenian heresy first suggested to Innocent III. the idea of an inquisitorial commission to take cognizance of irreligious teaching. This gave place, under Gregory IX., to the standing tribunal of Dominicans, called the Inquisition.

Monasti-
cism in the
ascendant.

A.D. 1178.

The reigns of Henry II. and his sons illustrate the growing pretensions of the monastic houses and the connivance given to these pretensions by the papal court. The abbots of Malmesbury and S. Augustine's, Canterbury, were encouraged to refuse the oath of canonical obedience to their respective diocesans, and Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, was impelled to write an indignant remonstrance on this subject to Alexander III. This kind of insubordination was shown in many other monastic centres. The abbots of Battle were in conflict with the bishops of Chichester, the abbots of Malmesbury with the bishops of Sarum, the abbots of St. Albans with the bishops of Lincoln. Canterbury, however, was the focus of all monastic pretension. "It seems," writes John of Salisbury, "as if hatred of their archbishops were an inheritance of the monks of Canterbury." Here, in consequence of Lanfranc's transformation of the cathedral chapters, the diocesan was also Abbot of Christ Church. The monks of Christ Church therefore claimed a voice in the election of the English

their day, the Waldenses conjured up an imaginary Apostolic age to disprove the antiquity of such institutions. The ideal Apostolic age was to be created out of such scanty details or indications as could be found in the New Testament, to the exclusion of other sources of information. Such a system has only to be supplemented by the idea that the New Testament can be interpreted aright by every unlettered pietist, to damage the pedigree and reputation of every doctrine and practice of the Christian religion. The ecclesiastical policy of such bodies is, in fact, a system of negation or "protest"—negation which, as history teaches us, gradually extends, and ends at last in absolute infidelity.

primate. Not satisfied with this claim, they endeavoured to overthrow the concurrent right vested in the bishops. Baldwin, Richard's successor, was elected by the bishops, but had to accept a distinct nomination from the monks of Christ Church. This archbishop tried to break the disagreeable connection by erecting A.D. 1185. a new canonical establishment at Hackington. He apparently proposed to transfer the electoral rights to this foundation, by presiding as abbot there instead of at Christ Church. The monks, however, obtained a letter from Pope Urban forbidding the undertaking.¹ The archbishop and other prelates protested against this interference of Rome. The monks, however, retained their rights, and a subsequent attempt to transfer the primate's abbotship to a new house at Lambeth was stopped in the same way.

Disputes of this kind were of frequent occurrence. The primate appointed by monks. A.D. 1205. The audacity of the regulars may seem to have reached its climax in 1205, when a party at Christ Church secretly appointed Reginald, their sub-prior, to the metropolitan see, and sent him to Rome to have his title confirmed before the king or prelates should get wind of the matter. The sub-prior not having scrupulously observed the oath of secrecy, the monks cancelled this appointment, and consented to elect the king's nominee, John de Grey, Bishop of Norwich. But the suffragan bishops had not been consulted: they appealed to the Pope against this second appointment. The dispute ended, as usual, in the establishment of a precedent advantageous to Roman assumption. The Pope first recommended, and then, by threats of excommunication, forced,² the monks to accept a third

¹ Gervas, Chron. 1491, 1495, 1496, 1530.

² The monks stood out boldly for de Grey in the papal presence. Matthew of

CHAP.

IV.

The Pope
appoints
Langton.
A.D. 1207.

candidate, his own favourite cardinal, Stephen Langton. The new primate was already distinguished as a divine¹ and a man of letters. He was destined to immortalize himself as the champion of the liberties of the English Church and people, the statesman who led the barons to identify their interests with those of the people, and the author of Magna Charta. It need not be said that Innocent III. did not foresee such a career when he appointed Langton to the primacy.

John wages
war with
the Church.

A.D. 1208.

John was justly indignant at the papal encroachment; he unjustly punished the Church for the offence of the unassailable Pontiff. Not content with expelling the monks of Christ Church from the kingdom, he vented his hatred of Langton in blind violence towards the whole body of Churchmen, who, with judicious management, might have been induced to side with him against the Pope. He wrote an insolent letter to Innocent, who replied by putting England under an interdict. The sufferings of the country under this sentence have been exaggerated. Langton contrived to mitigate its severity, and the bishops of Winchester, Durham, Warwick, and other leading Churchmen absolutely ignored it. John profited by it, as he expelled many of the clergy who enforced it and pocketed their revenues. Innocent next pronounced the excommunication of John, and (upon his refusing to come to terms with Pandulph, the papal nuncio) his deposition from the throne. Philip of France was charged to invade

Paris states that they had been previously bound by oath to the king not to accept any other nominee. Finding themselves between two fires, they preferred the wrath of the temporal to that of the ecclesiastical tyrant.

¹ He had been, it seems, president or chancellor of the schools of Paris. He held a prebend at Notre Dame as well as at York Minster. Dean Hook describes him as "profoundly erudite," and "distinguished as a poet, a schoolman, and a Biblical scholar." He had been made cardinal in 1206, and King John had written him a letter of congratulation on this occasion.

England, and the barons, victimized by John's rapacity and lust, viewed the invasion with indifference. John, now as abject as he had been arrogant, tendered a servile submission to Innocent. By a pact, the disgrace of which attaches to the barons no less than to the king, England and Ireland¹ were acknowledged to be fiefs of Rome, and the king was pledged to pay the papal suzerain one thousand marks yearly.² John having also promised to cease his persecution of the clergy, Langton ignored the papal sentences which were still in force, and, on his own responsibility, gave him absolution in Winchester Cathedral. This proceeding gave great offence at Rome;³ it was shortly followed by another yet more offensive. Stimulated by the bold example of the Churchmen, and acting under the advice of Stephen Langton, the barons demanded a formal security for the liberties of all classes, and the king was forced to make the concessions embodied in the Great Charter. But documents which protected the subject against his lord were as injurious to the Papacy as to the throne now that the Pope was suzerain of England; and those clauses which claimed for the Church of England her ancient rights and liberties, and protected her bishoprics from simoniacal appointments,⁴ were particularly displeasing to such a Pope as Innocent

A.D. 1213.

A.D. 1215

The
Charter
offensive
to Rome.

¹ Scotland, in the time of Edward I., followed the example of the sister kingdom. To defeat Edward's pretensions the patriots acknowledged the Pope as their suzerain, and confessed that Scotland had always been a fief of Rome.

² This payment was not abolished till 1366, when Edward III. ordered an investigation of John's conduct, and prelates, peers, and commons unanimously pronounced it illegal, and pledged themselves to support the king in resisting such papal encroachments.

³ Innocent, Ep. xvi. 164; cf. Ep. xvi. 89.

⁴ "I . . . in the first place constitute the holy Church of God a free Church, so that I will not sell it nor farm it out, nor will I, on the death of any archbishop, bishop, or abbot, take anything from the domain of the Church or its people until his successor takes his place."—Charter of Henry I., accepted by John in 1213, and confirmed by Magna Charta.

CHAP.

IV.

The crown
offered to
Louis.

A.D. 1217.

Survey of
general
history.

Innocent
III.
1198-1216.

III. Rome was henceforth on the king's side. Innocent annulled the Charter, excommunicated the barons, and pronounced the suspension of Archbishop Langton. These sentences were so far regarded that Langton journeyed to Rome to make remonstrance. Meanwhile, the barons, despairing of obtaining redress from such a king as Innocent's "well-beloved son in Christ, John the Illustrious," offered the crown to Louis, the eldest son of Philip of France, and in defiance of papal threats, that prince landed on the Isle of Thanet. The opportune deaths of John and Innocent extricated public affairs from a state of hopeless confusion. Langton returned unforgiven to confirm the Charter in the name of the boy-king Henry; Louis retired defeated by land and sea; the papal sentences were unheeded, and Langton actually wrested from Rome a promise that as long as he lived no legate should be sent into England.

This period begins with the great Hildebrand—it closes with the death of a pontiff of more extravagant pretensions and less respectable motives. Under Innocent III. the Papacy attained its acme of aggrandizement. The princes of Europe marched by his orders against the wretched heretics of Southern France; the powerful Philip Augustus of France and the weak John of England alike succumbed before him. The mendicant orders and the Inquisition—two influences of paramount importance in the Church history of after years—originate in this pontificate. The Greek Church acknowledged Innocent's supremacy, and its prelates attended at the fourth Lateran Council (1215), where seventy canons were passed by the Pope on his own authority. The most noticeable of these canons are those which assert the

dogma of transubstantiation, and declare that princes are obliged to clear their dominions of heresy under pain of excommunication and deposition. In the very grandeur of such Popes as Innocent III. lay the greatest danger to the papal power. The pretensions bequeathed by Innocent harmonized ill with the weak or contemptible characters of his successors, and the contrast suggested revolt. Nor did it escape notice that when papal assumption was backed up, as in Innocent's case, by real strength of character, the Hildebrandine ideal of a universal arbiter was so far from being realized that the Pope's influence was usually on the side of tyranny and oppression. "Woe unto him that justifieth the wicked for a reward," said the barons as they read the papal letter which denounced the Charter. Already the legitimacy of the misused prerogatives was matter of question, and men were heard to argue that "the ordering of secular matters appertaineth not to the Pope." Circumstances soon changed such chance expressions of discontent to an open policy of resistance, speaking through statutes of unequivocal import.

CHAPTER V.

The Thirteenth Century.

A.D. 1200-1300.

Struggle for constitutional government—Guided by great Churchmen—Convocation established—Convocation not distinct from Parliament for a time—Its constitution—The Church harassed by Pope and king—Grosseteste the Church's protector—Edward resists the Pope, but persecutes the clergy—"Statute of Mortmain"—The universities supplant the monasteries—The statute "Circumspecte Agatis"—Edward's collision with Winchelsea—Decline of the Papacy—Boniface VIII.—Papal encroachments resisted—Moral influence of Church waning—Statesmen bishops—Clergy and monks—Errors in doctrine and practice—Revival of religion by the preaching friars—Their success in England—They become demoralized—The friars at the universities—The friars and papal malpractices—Indulgences.

Struggle
for consti-
tutional
govern-
ment.

THE reign of Henry III. is marked by a continued struggle of the baronage, now thoroughly identified with the insular population, against arbitrary government on the part of the king. From this struggle there emerges a constitutional government in which the factors are the three estates of clergy, lords, and commons. The pretensions of the throne were still supported by Rome, for the most conspicuous feature in the policy of Henry III. was his devotion to the Papacy. The clergy continue to head the party of resistance. They protect themselves against king and Pope by conciliar action, involving the adoption of a representative system. Thus is established a precedent for Parliaments including burghers as well as knights of shires. The thirteenth century, according to Professor Stubbs, is "the golden age of English Churchmanship.

The age that produced one Simon among the earls produced among the bishops Stephen Langton, S. Edmund, Grosseteste, and the Cantilupes. The Charter of Runnymede was drawn in Langton's age; Grosseteste was the friend and adviser of the constitutional opposition; Berksted, the episcopal member of the electoral triumvirate, was the pupil of S. Richard of Chichester; S. Edmund of Canterbury was the adviser who compelled the first banishment of the aliens; S. Thomas of Cantilupe, the last canonized Englishman, was the chancellor of the baronial regency." The great statesmen, patriots, judges, and lawyers were in fact, now and for years afterwards, clerks in Holy Orders.¹ And if we except the foreigners foisted into benefices by the king or the Pope, the leading Churchmen gave unanimous adhesion to the party which clamoured for constitutional government. During this struggle, however, the difference between the lay and the clerical status was emphasized, the clergy being now subjected to new exactions, which did not press upon the laity, by the substitution of taxation of spiritual revenues for that of land. When King John proposed in 1207 to inflict a charge of this nature, it was resisted as without precedent. The attempt was repeated shortly afterwards by the Pope. Gradually this system of taxation became established, and the clergy were henceforth convened in distinct assemblies for purposes of taxation. It was thus that "the clerical estate worked out an organization as an estate of the realm, asserting and possessing deliberative, legislative, and

Guided by
great
Church-
men.

¹ Dean Hook enumerates the following offices as filled by clergymen in the reign of Edward III.: Lord High Chancellor, Keeper of the Privy Seal, Master of the Rolls, Master of Chancery, Chief Chamberlain of the Exchequer, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Clerk of the Privy Seal, Treasurer of the King's House, Master of the King's Wardrobe, etc.

CHAP.

V.

Convoca-
tion estab-
lished.

taxing powers." This, in fact, is the origin of Convocation, the Church's tax-paying agency until the year 1664, and her administrative agency—in theory at least—until 1717, and tolerated since the year 1854 as a debating society.

Convoca-
tion not
distinct
from Par-
liament for
a time.

The history of Convocation is, however, at this time so mixed up with that of Parliament that it is hard sometimes to distinguish the lay from the clerical convention. Sometimes a Parliament included not only the bishops and priors, but archdeacons and deacons. In the Parliaments summoned by Henry in 1265 and 1282 were proctors for cathedral chapters. In 1295 Edward held a mixed assembly, in which the Churchmen were represented by the same procuratorial arrangement as had been established for the province of Canterbury. During this latter reign, however, the clerical element plainly severs itself from the lay; the summons to Parliament¹ is sent only to the bishops and a limited² number of abbots and priors, and it is in Convocation that the clergy tax themselves. The abbots and priors retained their seats up to the time of the dissolution of the monasteries (1538). The arrangement by which the clergy are still represented in the Canterbury Convocation dates from 1283, when Peckham was primate. With the bishops, abbots, priors, deans, and archdeacons, there are two proctors for the clergy of each diocese, and one for each cathedral chapter. The arrangement for the Convocation of York is one in which the parochial clergy are more

Its consti-
tution.

A.D. 1283.

¹ From the year 1314 to the year 1340 the clerical proctors were summoned to Parliament. After 1340 their attendance in Parliament was rarely insisted on. After the beginning of the fifteenth century they appear to have ceased attendance.

² About thirty or forty, according to Palgrave. This number, with the episcopate, was sufficient to give the lords spiritual a majority in the Upper House, where all measures were at this time initiated.

fairly represented, two proctors being sent for each archdeaconry. This rule dates at least as far back as 1279. That two provincial synods were established rather than one national Convocation is explained by the jealous assertions of independence to which the northern metropolitans were addicted. The union of the two synods, one of the many wise reforms contemplated by Wolsey, will doubtless be effected when the Church recovers full liberty of action.

It was not till 1307 that any anti-Roman legislation was initiated by the Crown, and it would be hard to say whether the clergy in the thirteenth century suffered more from the Pope or from the king. The bold patriotism of Langton protected his brethren from exactions during his own lifetime. His demise (1228) was at once followed by a papal demand for a tenth of movables to prosecute the war against the emperor. The clergy vainly endeavoured to resist this demand. The king and the papal legate pulled together: the former lavished his patronage on Bretons and Provençals, the latter gave the English benefices to Italians. These foreigners, in most cases, resided wholly abroad. Already a claim had been made by Gregory IX. to two prebends in every cathedral and the allowance of two monks in each monastery. The patrons of livings were particularly aggrieved by the practices known as "provision" and "reservation." By "provision" a living not yet vacant was provided with its future incumbent by the Pope. "Reservation" gave unlimited facility for such provision, it being a claim on the part of the Pope to reserve to himself any benefice he desired. It was an evil time for all but favourites of the Pope and the king. The patronage of churches was usurped to the detriment of private patrons; the

The Church
harassed
by Pope
and king.

CHAP.

V.

A.D. 1240.

appointments to bishoprics were made without regard to the electoral rights of chapters; episcopal right of institution was ignored. Edmund Rich, the primate, though himself a papal nominee, protested against Pope and king, till sheer despair drove him from his post to die in peace abroad. At the Council of Lyons in 1245, Roger Bigod and others, as deputies for the realm of England, vainly demanded a relaxation of the "execrable extortions" of the Pope, by which it was said sixty thousand marks a year passed from the English Church into Italy. At a Parliament at Westminster in 1246, a list of grievances was drawn up and sent with special letters to the Pope, by each of the great bodies present, "the king, the bishops, the abbots, the earls, with the whole baronage, clergy, and people." Pope Innocent IV. appears to have answered haughtily, counselling Henry to take warning from the fate of the deposed Emperor Frederic. The king succumbed, and the clergy were harassed with fresh exactions.

Grosseteste
the
Church's
protector.

King and Pope found a resolute opponent of tyranny in Robert Grosseteste, the guiding mind of Simon de Montfort's party, who became Bishop of Lincoln in 1235. Although Grosseteste denounced the Papacy as anti-Christian¹ on his death-bed, we should err in attributing his protests to doctrinal considerations. Due allegiance to Rome as the centre of Christendom he at least allowed; but the avarice and ambition of the pontiffs Grosseteste was prepared to resist as emphatically as he did the arbitrary rule of the English king. When Innocent IV. nominated an infant nephew

¹ Or rather perhaps an individual Pope as an Antichrist. The special evils denounced by Grosseteste were abuse of indulgences, maladministration of patronage, employment of clergy in secular business, subjection of clergy to secular tribunals, and clerical marriages.

to a canonry at Lincoln,¹ Grosseteste made a bold and successful resistance to the appointment. With similar spirit he joined the committee of twelve, representing the three estates of prelates, earls, and barons, who refused to yield to Henry's demand for fresh subsidies A.D. 1244. unless the Charter should be confirmed and a Council appointed. Grosseteste on this occasion emphatically declined to respect a papal letter ordering the bishops to vote the subsidy. He wisely refused to hear of any severance of the clerical and lay interests in the treatment of this question. Grosseteste caused some sensation by preaching at Lyons² against the corruptions of the papal court in 1252. On one occasion he successfully combated the attempts of the monks of Canterbury to meddle in his diocese when the archiepiscopal see was vacant. Matthew of Paris describes how Grosseteste was once requested by Archbishop Boniface to examine a royal favourite who was about to be presented to the see of Chichester. He complied, and set the king's nominee aside on the score of ignorance. Equally conscientious was the patriot bishop in his enforcement of discipline and reform of manners among the clergy of his diocese. He was a warm supporter of the mendicant movement, which exercised as yet a beneficial influence in the country, and he employed the friars largely in his diocese. One of his last acts was to procure a bull from Innocent sanctioning a visitation of the religious houses.

The reign of Edward I., although it did little to Edward
resists the
Pope, but
persecutes
the clergy. lighten the burdens of the clergy, was really favourable to their interests in causing alienation between the two

¹ See Grosseteste, Epp., ed. Luard, 187; Pegge's Life, 295.

² For this sermon, of which copies were given to the Pope and cardinals, see Brown's Fasciculus, li. 250, seqq.

CHAP.

V.

A.D. 1272.

authors of oppression. This reign introduced a decided tendency to isolate England from all continental influences. Hence emanated the idea of an independent national Church, finally realized under Henry VIII. Richard I. had acknowledged the emperor as his suzerain; John and Henry had been vassals of the Pope; Edward, though usually dutiful to Rome, distinctly declared that his realm was independent of all foreign sovereignties. His reign produced measures directly detrimental to the papal pretensions, but indirectly also compromising the liberties of the clerical estate. Archbishop Peckham had signalized the first year of his primacy by a bold attempt to maintain the doctrine of the charters. In a Council held at Reading in August, 1279, he issued articles to the clergy, charging them to explain to their parishioners the sentence of excommunication prescribed against such as violated Magna Charta and such as obtained royal writs to obstruct ecclesiastical suits. Peckham was compelled by the king to renounce these articles. It was perhaps to retaliate on Peckham, as well as to stay the growth of the regular or monastic system, that the celebrated "*De Religiosis*" was passed in the same year. This Act, commonly called the "*Statute of Mortmain*," had been devised by Burnell, Bishop of Bath, Edward's chancellor. Its aim, as that of the subsequent "*Quia Emptores*" (1290), was to prevent damage to superior lords by transfer of property. A large proportion of property was at this time in the hands of the monastic corporations, and was consequently exempt from rendering knight service, from reliefs upon succession, and from other feudal imposts. Such unprofitable property was said to be in mortmain, or in dead hands, since as far as the superior lord was

"Statute
of Mort-
main."
A.D. 1279.

concerned the holders might as well be dead. The "De Religiosis" prohibited for the future such detrimental transfers. Henceforth all lands bestowed on persons or institutions incapable of fulfilling the legal obligations were to be forfeited to the immediate lord, or ultimately to the Crown. One important result of the "De Religiosis" statute was the impulse given to the university system. Henceforth the charitable were induced to bequeath their money for the maintenance of poor scholars at the universities, rather than for the foundation of monastic houses. The number of monasteries founded in the fourteenth century is small when compared with the long list of those which date from the Anglo-Norman reigns. It appears indeed that more religious houses were founded in the single reign of Henry III. than in the two hundred years which separated Edward from Henry VIII. By the statute "Circumspecte Agatis," passed in 1285, the protracted contest as to the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts was decided. The statute recognized the rights of the courts to hold pleas on subjects purely spiritual, *i.e.* tithes, mortuaries, churches, churchyards; and offences for which penance was due, to wit, injuries done to clerks, perjury, and defamation.

The uni-
versities
supplant
the monas-
teries.

The
statute
"Circum-
specte
Agatis."
A.D. 1285.

On more than one occasion Edward adopted towards the clergy a policy of high-handed tyranny. In 1294, when war with France was decided upon in Parliament, the king seized the treasures in the sacristies of monasteries and cathedrals, and proceeded to demand from the clergy a half of their revenues. The claim had to be granted; and it was in vain that the clerical representatives petitioned for a set-off in the repeal of the "De Religiosis" statute. In 1296, the demand for subsidies was repeated. But Pope Boniface VIII. had

CHAP.

V.

Edward's
collision
with Win-
chelsea.

just issued the bull "Clericis Laicos,"¹ forbidding the clergy to pay contributions, taxes, tenths, hundredths, etc., to the secular powers. Archbishop Winchelsea rashly made this bull the pretext for a clerical demurrer to the king's demand. Edward at once put the clergy out of royal protection, and proceeded to seize their chattels. Some came to terms with the king by private compacts; others were despoiled perforce. The archbishop persisted in a policy of resistance, and appears to have himself escaped spoliation. Edward as yet could not afford to lose his friendship, and therefore contrived to effect a reconciliation.

Decline of
the Papacy.

Boniface
VIII.

A course of legislation directly hostile to Rome was rendered possible by the collapse of the presumptuous Boniface, and the consequent subjection of the Papacy to France. Unworthy to be compared with Gregory VII. and Innocent III. in character or ability, Boniface VIII. (1294-1303) outdid these great Popes in his preposterous exaltation of the Roman over the temporal courts. The bull "Clericis Laicos," which anathematized all princes who should impose taxes on the clergy, has been already mentioned. The more celebrated "Unam Sanctam" announced that S. Peter's successor inherited the "two swords" of spiritual and temporal supremacy, and that submission to the Pope was absolutely necessary to salvation. But Boniface VIII. vainly tried to master Philip the Fair as Innocent III. had mastered John. The contest ended in the capture and ignominious treatment of the pontiff, who, driven to despair, committed suicide. With Boniface VIII. there passed away not only the

¹ This bull appears to have been specially aimed at Edward and Philip of France. It pronounces excommunication *ipso facto* on those who pay or promise, as well as on those who demand contributions.

political pretensions of the Papacy, but, for a time at least, its very independence. Clement V., a tool of the French king, retired to Avignon. A period of disgraceful subservience to France ensued, known as the Seventy Years' Captivity (1309-1378).

CHAP.

V.

The tendency to resist papal encroachment was again illustrated in England by the affair of William de Gainsborough. This ecclesiastic, on his promotion to the see of Worcester, unadvisedly accepted a papal bull investing him with the temporalities of the see, as well as with spiritual jurisdiction. He was punished with a fine, and was compelled to acknowledge the king's power over the temporalities (1302). About the same time a subject who had procured a bull of excommunication from Rome against his adversary was declared guilty of treason, and narrowly escaped hanging. In 1307, the Parliament held at Carlisle passed an Act forbidding the payment of tallages on monastic property, and other imposts by which money was taken out of England. At this Parliament a petition from certain of the laity was presented, praying for legislation to restrain exactions and abuses connected with papal pretensions, viz. "provisions," promotion of aliens, diversion of monastic revenues, reservation of first-fruits, and Peter's pence. The Parliament drew up a remonstrance, but took no further measures. The king's death shortly followed, and anti-papal legislation was deferred till the reign of Edward III.

Papal
encroach-
ments
resisted.

It is not surprising to find that during the thirteenth century the Papacy was fast waning in repute—the pontiff being regarded by many as nothing more than a foreign extortioner—nor that the whole Church was infected with the vices sanctioned by its head.

Moral
influence
of Church
waning.

CHAP.

V.

Statesmen
bishops.

A state of spiritual decadence prevailed during this and the succeeding century, against which the clergy did not even attempt to contend. We have noticed the important part played by the English clergy in the politics of the day. Work of this kind monopolized the attention of the leading Churchmen. They were usually the only persons of sufficient education to shine as lawyers, statesmen, leaders of party, and legislators; to these, rather than to clerical employments, they devoted themselves. The larger benefices were therefore wholly neglected, and the duties of diocesans, where performed at all, were performed by bishops *in partibus*,¹ or by stray bishops from Ireland and the Continent. The Tudor practice of rewarding court favourites with livings was already foreshadowed by the anomaly of an episcopate and priesthood whose best members were paid with Church revenues for serving the State. Between the incomes of these prelates and the working clergy there was a shameful disproportion. Poverty impelled the latter to eke out a livelihood as physicians, surgeons, or ecclesiastical lawyers. In the latter profession there appear to have been temptations to venality and peculation, and petty trickery. As Dean Hook points out, a clergyman thus employed lowered himself in public estimation, if not in fact, to the level of a modern pettifogging attorney. From the regulars the spiritual welfare of society received little or no consideration, though the religious houses contained many persons in holy Orders. The great

Clergy and
monks.

¹ Of these there was apparently a sufficiency. Piers Ploughman sarcastically marvels that Mahometanism is not extinct:

“So many prelates to preche,
As the Pope maketh,
Of Nazareth, of Nynyve,
Of Neptalym, of Damaske.”

Vision xv.

monastic officials took as active a part in politics as the bishops; the subordinate brethren went through a routine of religious services, and spent the rest of their time in school teaching, in agriculture, and in literary pursuits. The literary pursuits were, of course, conceived to be idleness by the unlettered opponents of monasticism; but the fundamental evil in the monkish system was not idleness, but selfishness. The maxim of the regular was self-preservation. He had chosen the monastic life as securing himself against damnation. Zeal for the souls of the worldly outside the monastery walls was no part of his Christianity. Hence the cure of souls in benefices possessed by regulars was the monopoly of an ill-paid vicar, the proceeds of the living being chiefly devoted to the maintenance and aggrandizement of the monastery. Meantime, it will be remembered, the spiritual life of Christendom was being sapped by the prevalence of superstition and by the exaltation of a religion of formalism. The Holy Communion, as the dogma of transubstantiation won general credence, became a priestly sacrifice and nothing more. The congregation attended not as communicants, but as spectators. Commemoration of Christian sanctity took the form of a superstitious respect for saintly relics, and these were, of course, multiplied by the clergy. While these and other superstitions did much to obscure the light of the Gospel, the indiscriminate use of indulgences threatened to exclude even the light of conscience. Penance was fast degenerating into something very like a formal barter for licence to commit sin.

Errors in
doctrine
and
practice.

The degenerate condition of the Church had roused the zeal of the begging friars early in the thirteenth century. At its outset the "mendicant" movement

Revival of
religion by
the preach-
ing friars.

CHAP.

V.

may be fairly regarded as an ebullition of genuine Christian enthusiasm. It was a "revival," akin in many respects to that initiated by the Methodists in the eighteenth century. If erroneous in some of their doctrinal tenets, the friars nevertheless possessed the essential traits of the successful missionary—conviction of the Gospel's claims, self-denial, fervent zeal, Christian sympathy, and that peculiar rhetorical power which moves the illiterate masses. In the history of such movements it usually appears that unpopularity is the measure of usefulness, and that success is ever accompanied by moral depreciation. Impulses of this nature are, in fact, curative or antagonistic, and for that reason cannot be permanent. When recognized by the world as commendable or even tolerable, it is because they have done their work and are become effete, or are sacrificing principle and drifting to hypocrisy. The mendicant Orders became one of the most pernicious influences of their age. They nevertheless make their first appearance as guilds of unexampled austerity and great usefulness. The origin of these Orders may be traced to the Spanish zealot, Dominic de Guzman, who, under the patronage of Innocent III., formed an itinerant guild of "friars preachers" to cope with the Albigenses of Southern France. Dominic's plan was to enlist on behalf of Catholic dogma agencies hitherto monopolized by the sectaries: "Zeal must be met by zeal, lowliness by lowliness, false sanctity with real sanctity, preaching lies by preaching truth." Nearly at the same time the enthusiast Francis of Assisi sent out a band of friars, who were to preach the Gospel to the poor in apostolic simplicity. The "Friars Minorite," as the Franciscans in their humility called themselves, were obliged to resign all worldly

A.D. 1216.

possessions, and to depend on alms for subsistence. This rule was afterwards adopted by the other Orders of friars. The extraordinary assumptions of S. Francis, whose zeal gradually degenerated into religious mania, gave the Order which bore his name a special popularity. In the year 1219 the delegates to the General Chapter of Franciscans numbered five thousand. The Dominicans—here called Black Friars, and in France known as Jacobins—entered England about the year 1221. They received encouragement from Stephen Langton, then primate. The Franciscans followed in 1224. Several years later came the other two preaching Orders, the Carmelites or White Friars, and the Austin Friars or Augustinians.¹

CHAP.

V.

That the mendicant mission infused new life into the Church of England appears undeniable. With it came a system of evangelizing unknown to the parochial clergy. The preaching friars penetrated into places where the parish priest was never seen—the lazaret house, the hospital, the foul courts and alleys of towns and cities. Ignorant of learned phraseology (the Dominican was not even allowed to possess a book), the friars spoke as from heart to heart, relying on their own enthusiasm, their knowledge of human nature, and some pretence to medicinal skill. The statesman bishop, the mass priest with his perfunctory routine of duty, the clerical summoner with his lawyer's appetites, compared badly with the new preaching brothers. They soon enlisted the sympathy of the higher classes, and from the streets and hedges passed into castles and palaces. Men of wealth were induced

Their
success in
England.

A.D.
1225-50.

¹ The brotherhoods professing the rule of S. Augustine were united in one guild by Pope Alexander IV. in 1256. The guild was converted into a preaching fraternity.

CHAP.

V.

to leave them bequests. That they might enjoy these Gregory IX. published a bull relaxing their rule of poverty. In 1245 Innocent IV. cancelled this restriction altogether, claiming however that all property of mendicant brotherhoods should be subject to the disposal of the papal see. In 1259 Matthew Paris, the Benedictine chronicler, describes the magnificent buildings reared by the Franciscans and Dominicans, and sneers at their change of principle.¹

They
become
demoral-
ized.

The sequel might have been anticipated. The friars became greedy bequest-hunters; their zeal for religious reform spent itself in abuse of the parish priests, and in defence of every papal encroachment on the Church. In their wake came a mob of sturdy vagrants, whose friar's cowl betokened nothing but a desire to live without working. Seldom has the irony of fate made practice so inconsistent with principles. From "having nothing"—in the words of the popular taunt—the friars had come to "possess all things;" beginning as religious enthusiasts who despised book learning, they were noted ere the close of the century as the most pedantic of hair-splitting controversialists. The universities, which had now ousted the monastic and cathedral schools, rang with the endless disputes of Franciscan and Dominican.

The friars
at the
universi-
ties.

The mention of the universities leads us to say a few words on the course of study at this time fashionable. In the twelfth century the studies of canon law and scholastic theology had been added to the ordinary educational curriculum, which had hitherto comprised only the "trivium" and "quadrivium."² Scholastic

¹ Matt. Paris, 612.

² The trivium included grammar, logic, and rhetoric; the quadrivium, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy.

theology, however, had degenerated since the days of Lanfranc and Anselm. Its professors now confined themselves to wearisome expositions of Peter Lombard, the high authority who had published the four "books of sentences." Under the influence of the friars in the thirteenth century, the system underwent another change—we can hardly say for the better. The works of Aristotle had lately risen to extraordinary favour, and had been translated and circulated under the patronage of Frederic II. A miserable combination of Aristotle and Christian theology succeeded the expositions of the *Sententiarum*, and a meagre system of philosophizing was thus introduced at the universities, to the utter exclusion of originality and critical investigation. The most eminent professors of the new scholastic theology—Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus—belonged to the two great brotherhoods. Inimical as the mendicant fraternities were to the parish priests, their invasion of the universities¹ was succeeded by yet fiercer antagonism among themselves. The Franciscans were Realists, the Dominicans Nominalists: the former magnified, the latter disparaged, the power of Free Will; the one party taught the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the other denied it. On account of these differences the universities were in a continual state of turmoil. In 1370 the satirist who wrote "*Piers Ploughman's Creed*" could show how the essential in religion with each Order was that no other Order should be credited.

The mendicant friars did as much to strengthen the ~~The friars~~

¹ The Franciscans preponderated at Oxford, the Dominicans at Paris. Some of the greatest schoolmen were educated at Oxford, e.g. Alexander Hales, Duns Scotus, Occam, and Bradwardine.

CHAP.

V.

and papal
mal-
practices.Indulg-
ences.

worst influences of the Papacy as to impair the dignity of the English clergy. These loyal servants of Rome were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction; they were not amenable to ecclesiastical courts, and they could give absolution in every parish. More pernicious still was their connection with the traffic in indulgences. The growth of this practice, now sanctioned by authority and destined to become the darkest blot in the mediæval system, deserves the reader's attention. We have shown how, in Anglo-Saxon times, elaborate penitential systems testified to the Church's anxiety that the repentant should give practical proof of their sincerity before restoration to Christian privileges. It was not uncommon in that period to prescribe a pilgrimage as a form of penance. In the twelfth century enlistment in the Crusades took the place of the ordinary pilgrimage. Next, men were taught that a papal absolution insured the soldier who fell in this holy cause against future consequences of sin. Payment to the cause was frequently accepted in lieu of actual service. The transition to a systematic sale of indulgences was made easier by the invention of the doctrine of "superabundant merit." Saintly excess of righteousness, it was taught, formed a treasury upon which the Church could draw for the benefit of her living members. The year 1300—that of Boniface's jubilee—witnessed an offer of indulgences of "extraordinary fulness" to all persons who should visit Rome. The enormous wealth accruing to the papal chest on this occasion perhaps suggested a further perversion. Papal hawkers, known as *questuarii* or pardoners, were employed to sell indulgences to all applicants. This degrading employment became the monopoly of the Dominicans. The student will remember that it was the spectacle of a

Dominican hawking pardons that first revealed to Luther the corrupt condition of the Church. The same sight had, however, roused the indignation of honest and intelligent Christians in every country a century before the time of Luther. In the next chapter it will be shown how the Lollard anarchists prevented such feelings from ripening into a reformatory movement.

CHAPTER VI.

The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.

A.D. 1300-1499.

Hildebrand's theory shattered—Doubtful limits of papal authority—Instances—

(1) Usurpation of patronage—The metropolitan sees—The suffragan sees—
 "Statute of Provisors"—(2) Invasion of the king's rights—Præmunire statutes—
 (3) Pecuniary exactions—Reformers—John Wyclif—His life—His religious
 system—Dangerous principles—Reform consequently impeded—Other reformers
 abroad—Legislation against Lollardy—Its aristocratic champion, Oldcastle—
 Wyclif's Bible suppressed—Bishop Pecock—Reforming movement on Church
 principles—The Councils—Reforming ecclesiastics—Hopeless condition of the
 Church—The New Learning.

Hilde-
brand's
theory
shattered.

In England, more than other countries, the prestige of the Papacy was lowered by the migration to Avignon. The glory of St. Peter's chair was dimmed, indeed, in the eyes of Englishmen when the Pope became the puppet of the dynasty which had experienced a Crécy and Poitiers. After 1332 the yearly payment to which John had pledged himself and his successors remained in arrear. To send such payment was virtually to subsidize a country at war with England. Urban V.'s demand for this tribute in 1366 was met with a declaration from all estates of the realm that King John had acted unconstitutionally, and it was unanimously determined to resist all such papal claims for the future. Never again did England acknowledge the theory of Hildebrand. How quickly the feudal relation to Rome was forgotten is shown by the language of the articles of complaint against King

Richard in 1399. The Parliament gravely declared that Richard's appeal to Rome for corroboration of statutes was culpable, because the crown of the realm and the realm itself had been "in all time past so free, that neither the pontiff nor any other person outside the realm has a right to meddle with the same."

CHAP.

VI.

On the other hand, the papal claim to spiritual supremacy was universally admitted. It was no easy matter to define in what way this prerogative could be recognized without intrusion on temporal interests. From the time of the collapse of the old Hildebrandine theory the mutual relations of England and the Papacy become complicated and difficult to analyze. The best method, perhaps, of realizing these relations in the period before us is to trace out the history of some of the more prominent papal prerogatives. It will be seen, on the one hand, that the legislation of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries armed the nation with statutes emphatically condemning papal usurpation. On the other hand, it appears that the connivance of the sovereign usually enabled the Popes to go on acting in defiance of these statutes, especially when the clergy were to be victimized. Theory and practice were thus at issue, and so remained until the Reformation.

Doubtful
limits of
papal
authority.

One of the most baneful practices of the time was papal usurpation of patronage. The claim to appoint to suffragan sees was based upon the old papal prerogative of taking part in the appointment of a metropolitan. The practice of applying to Rome for the pall has been frequently mentioned. As early as the late Saxon period the pall was deemed essential to the office of a metropolitan. Besides having to procure the pall from Rome, the mediæval archbishops were more or less pledged to allegiance by the fact

Instances—
(1) Usurpa-
tion of
patronage.

The metro-
politan
sees.

CHAP.

VI.

of their being *legati nati* or *ex-officio* legates. Archbishop Langton secured the title *legatus natus* for Canterbury, with the object of protecting the Church from the foreign representatives of Rome. But this appears to have been a short-sighted policy. The legatine office of the archbishop strengthened the papal pretension that all bishops were servants of Rome, without at all precluding the mission of foreign legates¹—legates *a latere*—when the Pope was powerful enough to send them. The *ex-officio* legation of the English primate dates from 1221. A hundred and thirty years later York secured the same doubtful honour at the instance of Archbishop Thoresby. All his successors in the northern primacy down to the Reformation period received the legatine commission and the pall. Langton's primacy introduced another and a more serious innovation. Hitherto the *election* of the metropolitan was conducted in England; the archbishop elect went to Rome for formal confirmation of his title. But Langton's case gave a precedent for the mission of an English primate from Rome without consent of king, bishops, or chapters. Edmund was appointed in 1234 in the same way as Langton. So, too, Kirkwardby in 1273, and Peckham in 1279. It was by papal "reservation" of the metropolitan see that Reynolds was appointed in 1313.

The suffra-
gan sees.

With respect to the suffragan sees, few attempts at papal interference are heard of until the thirteenth century. After the settlement of the "investiture"

¹ Who claimed to be superior to the resident legates. Of such legates Mr. Stubbs instances in the thirteenth century "Otho and Othobon, and that cardinal Guy Foulquois, who assisted Henry III. against Simon de Montfort. Their visits were either prompted by the king when he wanted support against the nation, or were forced on king and nation alike by the necessities of foreign politics."—Const. Hist., iii. p. 300.

controversy the chapters again enjoyed the right of free election, subject to the royal license and approval, which (according to the charter ceded to the bishops by John) were not to be withheld without due cause. The chapter elected; the archbishop confirmed the election and gave consecration; the Crown licensed and gave the temporalities in exchange for a promise of fealty. The Pope only intervened when these several prerogatives could not be exercised harmoniously. But this contingency was of frequent occurrence in the reign of Henry III., and from being an arbitrator in numerous disputed elections, the Pope became sole elector. Between 1215 and 1264 thirty disputed elections were referred to the papal tribunal. One of these at least—an election to the vacant see of Winchester in 1262—was settled offhand by the Pope putting in his own nominee. This plan had been already adopted by Innocent III. and Gregory IX., and the precedent was soon established in such a way as to extinguish the elective rights of the chapters. This papal prerogative was strengthened by the prevalent belief that no bishop could be translated¹ without papal sanction. Besides promoting the bishop translated, the Pope put forward a claim to fill up the see vacated by his translation. This claim established, a more general invasion of the rights of the chapters was easy. The claim to “provision” and “reservation” had been recognized since 1226² for minor pieces of preferment, the fourteenth century witnessed the extension of the same system to the bishoprics. Between 1317 and

¹ The practice of translating appears to have been rare hitherto.

² In this year the papal envoy, Otho, came to England and claimed for the Pope two prebends in each cathedral church. The claim was resisted. But subsequent Popes extended this kind of usurpation, even to livings in private patronage.

CHAP.
VI.

1334 seventeen appointments to bishoprics were "reserved," and the practice continued unchecked till 1350. In some cases the Pope appointed a person recommended by the king, but the rights of the cathedral chapters were usually quietly ignored.

"Statute
of Provi-
sors."
A.D. 1351.

The celebrated "Statute of Provisors" (1351), which made all persons receiving papal provisions liable to imprisonment,¹ really did nothing to restore these rights, and little to put down papal intrusion. The king and the Pope came to an understanding. The former asked the latter to give provision to his nominee, and this nominee was sent to the chapter for acceptance. Matters were not much more satisfactory under Richard II., despite more Statutes of Provisors and *Præmunire*. Henry V., however, restored to the chapters the right of election; and while the Papacy was itself contested, it was not difficult for the archbishop to exercise his ancient right of confirming the appointments. When Martin V. made good his claim, the abuse revived. Thirteen bishops were "provided" in two years, and Archbishop Chicheley was threatened with deprivation for not securing the repeal of the prohibitive statutes.² The reign of Henry VI. was a signal era of papal aggression. Under Henry VII. and Henry VIII., however, royal nominees appear to have usually secured the appointments.

A.D. 1417.

Ⓒ Invasion
of the
king's
rights.

The statutes which defended the king's rights generally against all manner of papal encroachments were not much more effective than those which prohibited

¹ 25 Edw. III. stat. iv. This statute also provided that all preferments to which the Pope should venture to appoint should be forfeited for that turn to the king.

² "The execrable statute of *præmunire*" was the special bugbear of Pope Martin. "By this," he writes, "the King of England assumes the spiritual jurisdiction, and governs the Church as completely in ecclesiastical affairs as if he had been constituted by Christ His vicar."

usurpation of patronage. The great "Statute of *Præmunire*"—that of 1393—had been anticipated by similar measures in 1353 and 1365.¹ That of 1365 was a distinct appeal against papal encroachment on the rights of the Crown, and was followed up in the next year by the repudiation of the national tribute to Rome. The term "*Præmunire*" is taken from the terms in which the writ against offenders was couched—"præmunire facias," etc. In the statute of 1393 it is enacted that "whoever procures at Rome or elsewhere any translations, processes, bulls, instruments, or other things which touch the king, against him, his crown, and realm . . . shall be put out of the king's protection, their lands and goods forfeited to the king's use." This statute was a response on the part of the king to a papal bull which prohibited bishops from executing the sentences of the royal courts in suits relating to patronage. Collusion between the Crown and the Papacy usually prevented its operation in the fifteenth century. In the sixteenth it was most unfairly made use of by Henry VIII. for the destruction of Wolsey.

CHAP.
VI.

Præmunire
statutes.

Besides the invasion of patronage and jurisdiction, (3) Pecuniary exactions of the Papacy constituted a grievance of most serious character. Despite the prohibition of 1366, Rome continued to gather an enormous tribute from England. Besides first-fruits and payments for bulls and dispensations, there were continual demands for subsidies for special purposes, as, *e.g.*, for crusades against the Turks or heretics. An official collector was established in England to gather in these

¹ That of 1353 is simply directed against those who "annul judgments in the king's courts" by taking their suits abroad. The court of Rome is not mentioned in this first Act of *Præmunire*.

CHAP.
VI.

contributions. Mr. Stubbs points out that "a series of petitions against the proceedings of this most unpopular official was presented in the Parliament of 1376," and that "in 1390 the king had to reject a petition that the collector might be banished as a public enemy." With respect to the clergy, who were the chief sufferers, it may be noticed that the claim to the first-fruits of bishoprics was first made by Alexander IV. in 1256. It was resisted from time to time, but vainly. In the Act¹ which bestowed these annates on the Crown, it is stated that the sum of £160,000 had been paid on this account to the Pope between 1486 and 1531.

Reformers.

These instances will enable the reader to appreciate the kind of hold maintained by the Popes in the age preceding the Reformation. To the abuses in doctrine and practice which had infested the churches we have already alluded. We have shown how the mendicant friars of the thirteenth century had not only failed to effect a reformation, but had added a fresh scandal by systematizing the sale of indulgences. The fourteenth century, equally alive to the degeneracy of Christendom, failed as conspicuously when it attempted measures of redress. When such men as the author of "*Piers Ploughman's Vision*"² bemoaned the wholesale appointment of bishops *in partibus*, or the officious intercession of the "pardoners," or when Fitzralph³ of Armagh denounced the mendicant orders in his "Apology against the Friars," they probably only ex-

¹ 23 Hen. VIII. c. 20, stat. iii. 386.

² This remarkable work is attributed to a priest named Robert Langland or Longland. According to Bale, he completed it in 1369. "*Piers Ploughman's Creed*" is probably an imitation of the "*Vision*" by a later hand.

³ Fitzralph was a man of some note. He was an eminent teacher at Oxford, where probably he imbibed his dislike for the friars. He took his grievances to Avignon, and several prelates subscribed to defray the expenses of the suit. The monks, however, were the party best able to buy papal favour. The case languished, and Fitzralph died at Avignon in 1361.

pressed sentiments of wide acceptance. But how were these abuses to be removed? This was a question which Fitzralph and Langland, and the scurrilous pamphleteers who endeavoured to imitate the "Vision" and the "Apology," were all alike unable to answer. John Wyclif was, it seems, the first to attempt a diagnosis of the disease for practical purposes. But in the hands of Wyclif's disciples remedial theories were quickly transformed into schemes of destruction. To these succeeded a reaction, for the cure was worse than the malady.

The early life of this remarkable divine is wrapped in obscurity. He appears to have been born at Richmond, in Yorkshire, about the year 1322. He went to Oxford, but of his doings there we have no record till he emerges as master or warden of Balliol. To another person bearing a similar name probably belong the fellowship at Merton and the mastership of Canterbury Hall¹ with which John Wyclif, the Reformer, has been sometimes credited. Equally unauthentic is the tradition which makes Wyclif the author of the "Last Age of the Church," a book which is probably the work of a Franciscan monk.² The treatise "On the Reality of Universals," written by Wyclif at Oxford, shows that he had adopted the philosophy of the Realists. Nominalism, the opposite school, had been for some time in the ascendant, and Wyclif's work appears to have caused some sensation. It was probably before 1365 that Wyclif was made a king's chaplain. This office in the mediæval times was frequently the first stepping-stone to political distinctions. In 1366 the Government

John
Wyclif—
his life.

¹ So Robertson, *History*, Book viii. chap. vi.: for the other view, see Lechler, *John Wyclif*, vol. i. p. 180, seqq.

² See Shirley, *Introd. to the Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, xiii.

CHAP.

VI.

A.D. 1374.

looked about for a clerical champion to defend the refusal of the arrears of tribute lately claimed by Rome. The royal chaplain gained prestige by supporting this policy in a public argument at Oxford. The employment of prelates in high secular offices was, as we have seen, one of the scandals of the age. The practice was attacked at this time by a self-seeking clique headed by John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. Wyclif, who out of regard for the Church's best interests denounced a system which supplied the court with intellect and ability at the expense of the diocesan centres, was compelled to serve under this despicable leader. The most prominent representative of the pernicious system was William of Wykeham—a man whose virtues were almost such as to exculpate his false position. Lancaster's party succeeded in ousting Wykeham's party for a time, and in depriving several prelates of their secular employments (1371). Wyclif next appears in the political conference between England and France, which had been arranged to take place at Bruges under the superintendence of papal nuncios. The English Church availed itself of this opportunity to send certain envoys, to petition the papal representatives for redress of grievances. Wyclif was one of these envoys. The grievances were those which so often recur in the clerical gravamens—levying of exactions, reservation of benefices, interference with bishoprics. The complaint elicited a worthless promise of redress. From his experience at Bruges, Wyclif probably learnt how thoroughly demoralized the papal system was. His learning enabled him to satisfy himself that the pretensions which had been so grossly abused had little or no foundation. He began to write, lecture, and preach on the subject in no measured

terms. His censures¹ extended from the Pope, who was "Antichrist, the proud worldly priest of Rome, and the most cursed of clippers and purse-carvers," to the luxurious prelates and ignorant parish priests of his own country. These strictures were doubtless to some extent prompted by political animosity. It was imagined, and not without reason, that Wyclif was one of the political faction who aimed at a confiscation of all ecclesiastical property. He was accordingly summoned to S. Paul's to explain his invectives before the primate, and Courtenay, Bishop of London.² At the convention there appeared with Wyclif his political allies, Lancaster and Lord Percy. The indecent behaviour of the duke to Bishop Courtenay provoked a tumult at an early stage in the proceedings, and Wyclif's party narrowly escaped the vengeance of the infuriated Londoners. Meantime the Pope had discovered that Wyclif was guilty of several heresies, and a bull was addressed to Oxford, ordering the suppression of his teaching. Oxford showed itself in no hurry to obey, and Wyclif acquired favour with the Government of Richard II. by arguing that the king could prohibit exportation of treasure even when demanded by the Pope. Lancaster's influence was much diminished by the death of Edward III., and A.D. 1377. henceforward Wyclif's cause ceased to be discredited by this unworthy supporter. The schism which followed the death of Gregory XI. saved him from papal vengeance, and for the future he had chiefly to reckon with the prelates of his own country, who were offended

¹ Lewis, *Life of Wyclif*, 31, 35-38.

² "The character of the prosecution," says Canon Robertson, "is shown by the fact that, although errors of doctrine had already been laid to his charge, those which were now brought forward related entirely to political and social questions."
—*History*, Book viii. chap. vi.

CHAP.

VI.

by his attacks on clerical property rather than his unorthodoxy. That the protests of these antagonists were not unreasonable was proved in 1381, when Wat Tyler's insurrection, and the murder of Archbishop Sudbury, showed how dangerous a spirit now animated the lower orders. It is absurd to argue that this socialist outbreak is attributable to Wyclif. But it is as absurd to deny that the communists would have found in Wyclif's writings, had they read them, a justification of their principles. From this time Wyclif's hold on the upper classes was loosened. His unpopularity was increased when his new opinions concerning the Eucharist were made known. These were reprobated even in quarters where his attacks on Rome had found readiest acceptance. Oxford expelled its great schoolman; a Council at London, under the new primate, Courtenay, condemned nine of his opinions as heretical, and fifteen as erroneous (1382). Three of his followers were subjected to punishment; and it is not easy to understand how Wyclif escaped, unless we accept his enemies' testimony that he baffled his accusers by an evasive and quibbling line of defence. Wyclif retired to his rectory at Lutterworth in 1382. He died in 1384. Shortly before his death he is said to have received a citation to appear before Urban VI. It appears that these two years of retirement were by no means a season of inactivity. It was at this time that he published his pamphlets "On the Schism" and "Against the Pope's Crusade," and the most pronounced of his doctrinal treatises, "The Trialogue." It is also recorded that he was assiduous in his duties as a parish priest, and that the country surrounding Lutterworth was for some years a notorious centre of "Lollardism."

The chief merit in Wyclif's system was that which, a hundred and fifty years later, secured Protestantism its extraordinary success. Against the objective religion of the mediæval Church, with its manifold perversions of doctrine and practice, Wyclif set up a religion of individuality based on an internal apprehension of the Saviour's atoning merits. This religion was to be formed exclusively from the Scriptures. He accordingly proceeded to publish a vernacular translation of the whole Bible. It is a much controverted point whether this publication was regarded as a dangerous novelty,¹ or whether the suppression of Wyclif's Bible is not fully accounted for by the great Reformer's socialist theories and so-called heresies, which it was presumed might be promulgated by its circulation. Passing from his broad principle of reform to doctrinal details, we find the most salient heresy of Wyclif was his opinion concerning the Eucharist. Rejecting all teachers since the year 1000, with the sole exception of Berengarius,² Wyclif took that view of the Sacrament which was afterwards adopted by Cranmer, and which has been explained in our Church

¹ Against this assumption the men of the Old Learning protested in the sixteenth century. Sir Thomas More writes thus: "The whole Bible was, long before Wyclif's days, by virtuous and well-learned men translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and solemnness well and devoutly read." With reference to Arundel's constitution prohibiting Wyclif's version, More remarks, "This order neither forbade the translations to be read that were done before Wyclif's days, nor condemned his because it was new, but because it was naught." It must, however, be remembered that More was strongly prejudiced, and may have based such statements on hearsay evidence. Between the Saxon period and the time of Wyclif, only two translators are known to us by name. Early in the reign of Edward III., William of Shoreham rendered the Psalter into English prose. Shortly afterwards the same portion of Scripture was translated by Richard Rolle, "the hermit of Hampole," with the addition of a commentary. The study of the Bible in the Vulgate Version was, of course, encouraged before Wyclif's time. We find Grosseteste advising the Oxford students to devote the best morning hours to scriptural studies, "in accordance with ancient customs and the example of Paris." See Seeböhm, *Oxford Reformers*, p. 3.

² See *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, 114; and compare Wyclif's *Triolog.*, ii. 7, p. 153.

CHAP.

VI.

Catechism. The Sacrament, according to Wyclif, was not a mere sign; the Body of Christ was in it virtually, spiritually, and sacramentally.¹ But it was not in it "substantially." As the accidents, so the material substance of the bread and wine remained after consecration. In other words, Wyclif maintained the doctrine of the Real Presence, but rejected the dogma of transubstantiation. Unfortunately, a number of fantastic and pernicious tenets were also held by Wyclif. They were for the most part evolved from his favourite proposition, "Dominion is founded upon grace." The Reformer argued that all kinds of dominion were granted by God on condition of obedience to His commandments. Disobedience cancelled the grant. It is easy to see how from such premises Wyclif reached the conclusion that the ministrations of bishops and priests who are in mortal sin are null.² It is also plain that confiscation of the unworthy rich and deposition of inefficient princes could be logically deduced from them by the socialist fanatics. Wyclif seems, however, not to have gone thus far; he qualified his propositions with the statement, "God must obey the devil in this world," meaning that evil must often prevail over good. The modification thus strangely expressed was, of course, misunderstood by his adversaries,³ and probably gave greater offence than the propositions he sought to tone down. Priests and deacons were conceived by Wyclif to be the only orders instituted in the primitive times. The "Cæsarean" bishops he accordingly designates as lesser Antichrists;⁴ the great

¹ Trialog., iv. 4, p. 256; 9, pp. 274, 275: see Fasciculi Zizaniorum, 107.

² An opinion which is disallowed in the Articles of our Church (Art. XXVI.). Wyclif's words are, "Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus episcopus, nullus est prælatus, dum est in peccato mortali." See Shirley, *Introd. to F. Z.*, lxiii.; Trialog., iv. 19; Walsingham, ii. 53.

³ See Shirley, lxiv.

⁴ Trialog., lxi. 17.

Antichrist predicted in Scripture he supposes to be the Pope. But most of the evils in the Church are ascribed by Wyclif to the existence of endowments. Against these he directed his most passionate invectives, actually arguing that it was a greater sin in Constantine to endow the Church than it was in Paul to persecute it.¹

CHAP.

VI.

When we reflect that opinions so discordant with the spirit of the age were usually couched in whimsical and exaggerated language, we cannot wonder that Wyclif's religion of individuality and free inquiry was palatable to few besides crazy fanatics and greedy socialists. Wyclif's theories had, indeed, only to be pushed to a legitimate extent to make Christianity intolerable to society. In so speaking we cannot except the theory—afterwards endorsed by some Protestant sects—that all religion is to be got from the Bible, each reader being his own commentator. In effect, the Lollards found it as easy to prove that Biblical patriarchs married within the degrees of consanguinity, or that the early Christians were communists, as their master had found it to prove that bishops were one with priests in the Apostolic age. For many years after Wyclif's death England teemed with turbulent persons, whose sanctimonious professions cloaked a desire to hasten to opulence at their neighbour's expense. It was unscriptural for ecclesiastics to possess property. It was scriptural that "the saints," *i.e.* themselves, should "possess the earth." It was scriptural to maintain opinions with which the vagaries of mediæval theology contrasted as the mote with the beam. Such were the natural results of Wyclif's appeal to popular ignorance. The educated were soon convinced that the

Dangerous
principles.¹ Trialog., iv. 17, 18.

CHAP.

VI.

Reform
consequently
impeded.

Bible was dangerous reading for the populace, and measures were taken to prohibit the circulation of Wyclif's version. Worse still, a deep-rooted prejudice was established in the upper classes against all schemes for reforming the Church. Especially apparent was this feeling among the nobility. Now, in fact, as often since, the burning house of the clerical Ucalegon was too perilous to his lay neighbour to be a gratifying spectacle. Much of the legislation against the Lollards is really illustrated by the Parliamentary petition of 1413, imploring Henry IV. to silence those who inveighed against tenure of property by ecclesiastics, "because" (such is the excuse of the lay lords for protecting the clergy) "it is very likely that in process of time they will also excite the people of your kingdom to take away from the said lords *temporal* their possessions and heritages."

Other
reformers
abroad.

In several parts of the Continent, and notably in Bohemia, opinions resembling those of Wyclif survived. Occasionally the principle of salvation by personal faith was presented in its purity, without detriment to order and discipline, and without sanction to individual conceit. The "Friends of God," and the "mystics," Eckart, Tauler, Gerson, and Hamerken (better known as Thomas à Kempis), may be instanced as burning and shining lights in an age of deep darkness, and from them the sacred fire was handed down to a more favoured generation. But of the much-vaunted name of Wyclif no such abiding influence can be predicated. Wyclifism disappears from view save as the creed of a wrong-headed and turbulent few. When the day of English reformation arrived, it does not appear that our Reformers professed sympathy with the eccentric schoolman.

The legislation against Lollardy is particularly noticeable, because it habituated England to that principle of extirpating religious error by brute force, which in the sixteenth century is so amply and unhappily illustrated. As early as 1381 the sheriffs had been¹ charged to arrest and bring to trial the Lollard preachers, as men who sowed "discord and dissension" and "excited the people to the great peril of the realm." The accession of the Lancastrian dynasty inaugurated a severer course of action. Burning was already the nominal punishment of heresy by the common law; but only one² case of its infliction is recorded before the year 1400, when Parliament passed the statute "*De Hæreticis Comburendis*."³ The preamble charges the Lollard preachers with "wickedly instructing and inflaming the people, and as much as they may, exciting and stirring them to sedition and insurrection." The statute orders that all persons convicted of teaching heresy must either renounce their errors or be delivered over by the bishop to the mayor or sheriff, "who shall bring them before the people to be burnt." The progress of the socialist movement under Sir John Oldcastle led to a supplementary Act in the reign of Henry V., according to which all judges, sheriffs, etc., were to be sworn to extirpate Lollardy.⁴ William Sawtrey, a London priest, was the first victim of the statute of 1400. Other ordained men suffered within the next

CHAP.

VI.

Legislation
against
Lollardy.
A.D.
1381-1415.

¹ 5 Rich. II. c. 5.

² It is recorded that in 1222 a deacon, who had been perverted to Judaism, was condemned at Oxford and burnt or (according to Matthew Paris) hanged. Ann. Wykes., p. 63; Matt. Paris, p. 315.

³ 2 Hen. IV. c. 15.

⁴ Henry VIII. repealed the "*De Hæreticis Comburendis*," to replace it by an Act which, while making allowance for the transfer of papal supremacy to himself, re-enacted the punishment of burning for heresy, and also facilitated the legal process by diminishing the precautions hitherto taken with respect to informers. The penalty was not finally abolished till 1677.

CHAP.
VI.

twenty-five years, viz. William Thorpe, William Taylor, and the monk Garentin. But the majority of the victims were small tradesmen and illiterate persons. The number of those who suffered was not great; and in criticising this Act we must bear in mind that the safety of the country depended on the suppression of these turbulent and licentious sectaries. To complain that the instrument of suppression sanctioned a punishment of fearful cruelty, is merely to complain that it was the statute of a mediæval Parliament.

Its aristocratic
champion,
Oldcastle.

To the aristocracy Lollardy was, as we have already observed, almost as offensive as to the clergy. Nevertheless, one person of rank was found to head the Lollard rioters of the reign of Henry V. Sir John Oldcastle, who married the widow and claimed the title of Lord Cobham, is supposed to be the original of Shakespeare's Falstaff.¹ He appears to have inferred from the dissolute character of Prince Henry's youth that the throne might be overthrown by a republican league. Accordingly, on the death of Henry IV., Oldcastle attached himself to the Lollard faction. He hired agents to raise disturbances in the dioceses of London, Rochester, and Hereford. He also caused menacing placards to be posted on the doors of the London churches, affirming that the Lollards were prepared to rise, a hundred thousand strong. Oldcastle was apprehended, and the king himself, mindful of former friendship, endeavoured to argue with him. This failing, he was tried before Archbishop Arundel and excommunicated.² The civil powers subsequently committed him to the Tower. Oldcastle appears to have expressed a

¹ See Collier's Shakespeare, Introd. to "Henry IV."

² See the report, "*Processus contra Johann. Oldcastle*," quoted at length in Hook's *Archbishops*, chap. xvii.

disbelief in the doctrine of transubstantiation and the efficacy of pilgrimages. In view of these opinions, Foxe represents the demagogue as a martyr, and the primate as a "beast," "wolf," "Caiaphas," and "bloody murderer." Whether Oldcastle was in any true sense a religious man is really unknown. He contrived to escape from the Tower, and lay concealed in Wales for four years. During this time he appears to have kept up his communications with the revolutionary faction.¹ A riot was raised by the Lollards in St. Giles's Fields. Sir John was shortly afterwards discovered and made an example of. The scene of the riot was appointed as the place of execution. Its manner denoted the two-fold offence—treason and heresy—the criminal being first hung in chains and then burnt.

The measures for suppressing the Lollard Bible were probably suggested by Archbishop Arundel himself. The provincial synod of Canterbury held at Oxford (1408) issued the celebrated "Constitutions" which bear his name. These forbid all preaching unlicensed by the diocesan—thus silencing both the popish friars and the Lollard preachers—and prohibit the reading of Scripture in Wyclif's English version. The inaccuracy of the version and the seditious designs of those who circulated it perhaps sufficiently explain such enactments. Other translations, such as the clergy had been wont to place in the hands of educated laymen, were, of course, not suppressed;² and it ap-

Wyclif's
Bible sup-
pressed.
A.D. 1408.

¹ In 1414 a proclamation was issued by the Government, charging the Lollards with the intention of constituting Sir John Oldcastle, of Couling, in the county of Kent, regent of the realm. *Fœdera*, ix. 170.

² Such was the interpretation put on the constitution by the great lawyer, Bishop Lyndwood, about twenty-two years afterwards: "*Ex hoc quod dicitur 'noviter compositus' apparet quod libros libellos vel tractatus in Anglicis vel alio idiomati prius translatos de texta Scripturæ legere non est prohibitum.*"

CHAP.
VI.

pears from Arundel's "Constitutions" that a vernacular version, authorized by a provincial council, was already contemplated.¹ The theory that religious thought was suppressed at this period, as it was in the reigns of the Tudors, appears to lack confirmation. What lax opinions with regard to the established doctrines and practices of the Church were sometimes openly preached may be gathered from the career of Reginald Pecock.

Bishop.
Pecock.

This free-thinking and somewhat unscrupulous prelate has been erroneously classed² with the sectarian or anti-Roman party. Really, he was chiefly notorious as an ultra-Romanist. He was educated at Oxford, and became a fellow of Oriel in 1417. He distinguished himself in the Church, and in 1444 became Bishop of St. Asaph by means of a papal provision and prepayment of some portion of the episcopal revenue. This was an offence against the "Præmunire" statutes, but Pecock defended his conduct by arguing that all ecclesiastical property belonged originally to the Pope. On similar grounds he argued in favour of papal pensions and the payment of annuities. Pecock's enunciation of these opinions caused great indignation among his brother bishops. He incurred no punishment, however, and was subsequently translated to Chichester. Pecock inclined to the theory broached by Wyclif, that all the tenets of Christianity are to be extracted

¹ The Constitutions prohibit the introduction of any new translation till it "shall be approved either by the bishop of the diocese, or, if necessary, by a provincial council."—Wilkins' Concil., iii. 317. No version received conciliar sanction, but if Sir Thomas More is to be believed, other translations than Wyclif's sometimes received a kind of episcopal licence for private use: "Myself have seen and can show you Bibles fair and old, which have been known and seen by the bishop of the diocese, and left in laymen's hands and women's, to such as he knew for good and catholick folk, that used it with soberness and devotion."

² See Foxe, the martyrologist. It is amusing to find this imaginative writer holding a brief for the most pronounced "papist" of his day, simply because he was accused of heresy.

from the New Testament, studied apart from other ecclesiastical literature. Thus restricting the field of inquiry, he was led to reject not only transubstantiation, but also some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity—our Saviour's descent into Hades, and the operation of the Holy Spirit. This, at all events, was the charge brought against him. But Pecock's theological position is somewhat unintelligible—wholly so to those who make him a genuine Lollard. He certainly maintained very strongly the supremacy of the Pope, giving the Papacy a divine institution, and making all episcopal authority emanate therefrom. At the same time he took a broad, intelligent view of such usages as pilgrimages and adoration of images; and against clerical celibacy he emphatically inveighed. His want of patriotism in policy, rather than his peculiar views in religious matters, led to his expulsion from the House of Lords in 1457. The next year his heretical opinions were the subject of an examination conducted by Archbishop Bouchier. It appears that what specially irritated his inquisitors was Pecock's crafty exaltation of the Pope over Councils. This, however, Bouchier did not care to say plainly. He condemned Pecock as heretical for his audacious denunciations of the Councils. Menaced with the usual penalty, Pecock saved himself by abjuring his opinions. His deprivation and a bloodless sacrifice of his books satisfied the authorities, but the populace, "inflamed into fury against the man who exalted the Pope above the Church,"¹ were with difficulty prevented from rabbling him. The bishop had suffered in the cause of the Pope. Three papal bulls were therefore launched against Bouchier in vindication of Pecock. But the

¹ See Hook's account, *Archbishops*, vol. v. chap. xxi.

CHAP.

VI.

only result was that the papal client was committed to stricter confinement. He escaped, however, the more serious penalties of *præmunire*, and was allowed to end his days at Thorney Abbey, in enjoyment of everything except liberty.

Reforming
movement
on Church
principles.

Pecock's medley of opinions will not secure him a place in the ranks of reforming ecclesiastics. It must not, however, be imagined that the cause of reformation found no worthier champions at this period than the English Lollards or their congeners abroad, or that sober-minded Churchmen were blind to abuses which had been made the pretext for sectarian extravagances. To some of the "mystic" or "pietist" school of reformers within the Church we have already alluded; and an age in which the "Imitation of Christ"¹ was written and extensively circulated can hardly be considered quite void of spiritual life. The need of reformation was the constant theme of pulpit oratory. The attempts on the part of individuals and of Churches to probe the wounds of Western Christendom were at least earnest, if ineffectual. It is impossible in such a work as this to do more than indicate some few of these attempts. Foremost we rank the proceedings at the great Church Councils. These Councils, in seeking to effect amendment, seriously disparaged the assumptions of the Papacy. The Seventy Years' Captivity had ended in 1378, to be succeeded by the deeper disgrace of a two-headed Papacy. In dealing with this anomaly the Church reasserted the ancient principle that Popes are subordinate to General Councils. The legation of cardinals which proposed to the English Church this solution of the question at issue was received with

¹ Probably written by Thomas Hamerken of Kempton, canon of Zwoll (died 1741).

enthusiasm. At Pisa (1409), Constance (1415), and Basle (1431), earnest attempts were made to effect a reformation of the Church. England sent to Pisa a gravamen worthy of her Church. The most flagrant abuses in English Christianity were declared to be the appropriation of benefices by religious houses and State officials, who made insufficient provision for the spiritual charge of the parishes—the non-residence of bishops, who were often aliens ignorant of the native tongue—the purchase of papal favours with bribes—and the exemption of monastic houses from episcopal control. These abuses are summed up in a memorial which was prepared at Oxford and laid before the Council of Pisa by the chief English delegate, Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury. The representatives of Christendom at these three Councils doubtless accepted it as a principle that the root of the evil lay in the unwarrantable pretensions of the Papacy. The Council of Pisa deposed and excommunicated both the rival Popes in favour of a new nominee. The Council of Constance distinctly declared that Popes were inferior to Œcumenical Councils, and removed the wicked John XXII. from the pontificate. The Council of Basle, which deposed Eugenius IV., proceeded to abolish annates, expectatives, provisions, and reservations, and restored to the chapters and metropolitans the right of appointing to benefices. The decrees of Basle were embodied in the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438. They were accepted by Pope Nicholas V. But subsequent Popes indignantly repudiated the guiding principle of these Councils. The supremacy of the pontiff over Councils was reasserted, and the Church's attempt to secure reformation by conciliar action was thus made fruitless.

Besides united action, attempts were made by leading

CHAP.

VI.

Reforming
ecclesi-
astics.

ecclesiastics to reform abuses in their own provinces. In Spain, Cardinal Ximenes undertook a sweeping visitation of the monasteries (1495). In England, Archbishop Morton had applied to Innocent VIII. for a bull empowering him to conduct a similar work (1489). The duty subsequently devolved on Cardinal Wolsey. At Florence, Savonarola waged war against the vices of society with a sincerity and earnestness which more than condone his many errors.

Hopeless
condition
of the
Church.

But decrees of Councils and individual exertions were alike powerless against evils which literally lay at the heart of Christendom. The Papacy exhibited in the person of Alexander VI. the most detestable of all its representatives. Not long afterwards came Leo X., who, in order to build S. Peter's, re-established the practice of hawking indulgences. This period closes on a scene of general depravity, which Cardinal Bellarmine thus describes: "Some years before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, according to the testimony of those who were then living, there was almost an entire abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical judgments, in morals no discipline, in sacred literature no erudition, in divine things no reverence: religion was almost extinct."¹ Perhaps the best influence was that intellectual revival which in the next century served as the handmaid of theology, and powerfully aided the work of reformation. As yet, however, it was little more than a resuscitation of mental energy, having little in common with Christianity, and nowhere less than in Rome itself. The importance of Greek—a study lately revived—in the field of theological research was as yet hardly recognized. In so speaking, we may make an

¹ Concio, xxviii., Opp. vi. 296.

honourable exception in favour of England. In the hands of such men as Colet and Grocyn, Linacre and Warham, the literary impulse had already assumed a theological and a practical bearing. By these and other English scholars the facilities offered by the New Learning for the study of early Christian literature were rightly valued. The connection of such studies with religious reform was consequently appreciated at Oxford some years before the Protestant movement in Germany. The work of these educational reformers will be noticed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII.

Henry VIII.

A.D. 1509-1534.

Marriage with Catharine—Protestantism—Its history—Its principles—Its unscientific character—Its schismatic tendency—Its relation to the English Reformation—The English Church under Wolsey—Wolsey's downfall—Other Reformers at the universities—The divorce question—Result of negotiations with Rome—The appeal to the universities—Cranmer becomes primate and decides the question—Anti-papal legislation—Papal licences and bulls prohibited—The king's ecclesiastical supremacy—The Commons extort the "submission of the clergy"—Annates, etc., prohibited at the instance of Convocation—"Statute for the Restraint of Appeals"—Negotiations with the Pope resumed to no purpose—Papal interference in bishoprics prohibited—The separation is accomplished, the clergy acquiescing.

Marriage
with
Catharine.

ARTHUR, the eldest son of Henry VII., had died in 1502, shortly after his marriage with Catharine, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. A scheme suggested itself to the grasping English king for retaining the large dowry and the political advantages which were accessories to this alliance. Henry, the heir to the throne, a boy of eleven years of age, should be betrothed to his brother's widow. Appeal was made to Rome for a dispensation sanctioning this irregular union, and it is noticeable that at the outset it was urged—with what truth is now unknown—that the marriage of Arthur and Catharine had never been consummated. So grave, however, were the objections to a union between persons thus related, that two Popes refused to accede to the king's request. Julius II. was at length

persuaded to grant a full dispensation, allowing Catharine to marry Henry, even if the marriage with his brother had been consummated (1504). Even now it seemed probable that no use would be made of the sanction thus hardly won. Religious scruples and a rupture with Spain combined to induce Henry VII. to relinquish the scheme, and the young prince was persuaded to repudiate his marriage contract with all requisite formalities before Fox, Bishop of Winchester (1506). Even now the avaricious sovereign could not face the prospect of resigning Catharine's dowry. Negotiations with the Spanish court were renewed, and the formal repudiation was considered cancelled. Prince Henry grew up cheerfully accepting this strange alliance as his destiny, and when he succeeded to the throne at the age of eighteen, his Council urged the speedy fulfilment of his father's scheme. Accordingly, on June 3, 1509, King Henry VIII. was married to Catharine of Aragon. Though his bride was eight years his senior, the happiness of the king's union was for many years all but complete. The exception was in the matter of children; several times Catharine had been delivered, but only one child, and that a girl, was the surviving issue. During this period of Henry's reign the management of affairs political and ecclesiastical was confided almost exclusively to Thomas Wolsey, a devoted minister, whose energy made ample amends for the youthful king's disinclination for business.

A.D.
1509-1523.

The conduct of ecclesiastical matters in England during Wolsey's administration will be noticed hereafter. The student's attention must for the present be directed to the great religious changes now taking place on the Continent. We have seen how general

Protestant-
ism. Its
history.

CHAP.
VII.

- and how hopeless was the yearning for religious reform in the preceding century. In the Protestant movement these pent-up feelings at length found adequate expression. The origin of this movement was a dispute between Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk and professor of theology at Wittenberg, and John Tetzel, a Dominican employed by Leo X. to hawk indulgences. From impugning papal indulgences, Luther went on to assail other notorious abuses in the Roman system. Against these he inveighed in the "Tract against Popedom" and "The Babylonish Captivity." Though
- A.D. 1517. Luther's opinions were condemned by the princes and prelates of the empire at the Diet of Worms, they soon gained numerous and influential adherents. The anti-papal agitation became connected with the intellectual revival mentioned in the preceding chapter, and its promoters were usually known as the men of the New Learning, a designation which of right belonged to educational reformers who had nothing to do with the Lutheran movement. When the second Diet of Spire
- A.D. 1529. deferred the subject of religious reform till a General Council should be called, the new religionists "protested" against the prorogation, and thus precipitated a schism. The societies in which they were incorporated were hence called "Protestant." Protestantism found adherents in all grades of society. It included pious and learned divines who longed for doctrinal reform. It appealed to such men of rank as grudged the clergy their social and political dignity, no less than to those who sincerely regretted the moral degradation of the Church. The lower orders welcomed a system which seemed conducive to civil and religious liberty. In many places, indeed, the new scheme of religion assumed that socialist character which had tainted the

Lollard system. The seditious teaching of the fanatic Münzer and the gross immoralities of the Anabaptist section were, however, emphatically disowned by Luther. The new religion became the basis of a political union, and a protracted war was waged between the emperor and the allied Protestant principalities. Of this war we need only say that it ended in a compromise at Augsburg, whereby the Protestants of the empire secured toleration by promising A.D. 1555. loyalty.

The principles asserted by the Protestant Reformers must now be noticed. Their adversaries might have urged that on almost every point of doctrine the leaders of the Protestant movement were at variance. Nevertheless certain definite hypotheses lay at the base of all the new systems of the sixteenth century, and justified a claim to affinity where outward unity was unattainable. The disciples of Luther, Melancthon, Zuingle, Calvin, all maintained that the mediæval system, with its machinery of propitiatory masses, indulgences, works of satisfaction, and works of supererogation, had caused men to undervalue personal faith in the Saviour. Individual appreciation of the fact of the Atonement was, they agreed, the end and aim of Christianity. The means employed by the Church to secure this were, some illegitimate, some inefficient, many unduly aggrandized so as to be themselves ends rather than means. A new system must therefore be developed: and since all subsequent periods in Church history had been more or less corrupt, the "re-formation" must be based on the Gospels and such other relics of the Apostolic age as the Church had included in her canon of Scripture. For such a second creation of Christian religion the recent literary impulse, with its principles.

CHAP.

VII.

Its
scientific
character.

its revival of the study of Greek, might seem to have offered great facilities. But by Luther and the Protestant doctors the questions which this remodelling of Christianity revived were submitted to the adjudication, not of scholarship, but of individual proclivity, and this was considerably biased by the recoil from the Church's system. The relative value of the several New Testament writings—even the genuineness of some—had first to be accurately determined. But the decision of the Protestants on these points was so arbitrary as to be worthless. S. James's Epistle insisted on the efficacy of good works, and this efficacy had been overrated by the mediæval Church; therefore this Scripture was, according to Luther, "an epistle of straw." On the other hand, S. Paul, writing to men who had mounted to Christianity from Judaism, had said much about the superiority of personal faith to religion of system. Personal faith was the Protestant panacea; therefore the basis of the new Christianity was St. Paul's Epistles, rather than the Gospels or other New Testament Scriptures.

Its
schismatic
tendency.

When the Protestant doctors got beyond these elementary questions, they found it impossible to agree about the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, the extent of free-will in man, the relations of faith and works in the scheme of salvation, the form of government to be adopted by Christian bodies, and the duties of Christians to the civil authorities. Schisms consequently ensued, and the Protestant movement resulted in the production of many disintegrated societies. Some of these differed from the Catholic Church of the early ages only in points of discipline. Many of them, however, evolved from the Scriptures systems by which personal faith was made to sanction or excuse gross

immorality and insubordination to all constituted authority. The increase of Protestant sects has created in modern times a belief in the right of "private judgment" in religious matters. Such a belief would seem to be a logical deduction from the premises of Protestantism. It must be noted, however, that the early Protestant doctors, and their Puritan successors (both of whom punished what they considered heresy with death), persistently disowned it.

The new system obtained a hold in Denmark, Sweden, and Scotland, which was destined to be permanent. The tenure of Protestantism in France, the Low Countries, and Southern Germany was for various reasons more precarious. In England its principles were thoroughly sifted during the "Reformation period," the ascendant being gained now by the State Churchman, now by the Romanist, now by the Puritan. This period of transition ranges over some hundred and thirty years. Its progress was illustrated by many new religious formularies, of which the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1571, and the Canons and Catechism of 1604, are the chief survivors, and by repeated revisions of the Use of Sarum, of which our Liturgy is the final outcome. The earliest of these publications is the Ten Articles of 1526; the last is the Prayer-Book of 1662, which has received no additions of doctrinal importance.

Such a transition was rendered possible by a change in the political constitution of the Church, which, though contemporaneous with the Lutheran movement, was not connected with it either in origin or purpose, and to which England had really been drifting ever since the accession of Edward I. The change we allude to was the formal repudiation of papal supremacy—a repudiation enforced by King Henry VIII. from

Its relation
to the
English
Reforma-
tion.

CHAP.
VII.

questionable motives, but welcomed by most English Churchmen as a measure which, without impairing the catholicity of their country, opened the way for long-desired ecclesiastical reforms. These internal reforms were carried on throughout Henry's reign, seldom with singleness of aim, but always without detriment to the Church's continuity. In the administration of Edward's Erastian Council the foreign Protestants found a coign of vantage, and at that time assimilation to the new and hastily formed continental systems seemed imminent. Through this crisis, however, the English Church passed without loss of Apostolical succession or Catholic doctrine; and at no subsequent time was anything done that invalidated her claim to be the very society planted by Augustine, or that merged her among the new creations of Protestantism. She repudiated the mediæval doctrine of papal supremacy, yet remained Catholic; she appropriated the real fruits of the continental revolution, yet never became a sect.

The
English
Church
under
Wolsey.

A brief account of the administration of Wolsey will illustrate the condition of the English Church just before this formal severance from Rome. It will be borne in mind that for years past good men had recognized the necessity of a reform in the English Church, though unable to mark out the lines on which such reform should be based, and entirely averse to anything like doctrinal change. Of such persons Cardinal Wolsey is a favourable type. The character and the reforming influence of this great statesman appear to have been undervalued in consequence of the misrepresentations of contemporaries who profited by his disgrace, or were in other ways interested in disparaging him. Impartial modern historians have vindicated Wolsey's fame and acknowledged the ser-

vices he rendered in preparing England for the Reformation. Thomas Wolsey appears to have been born of humble parentage¹ at Ipswich, in 1471. He took his degree at Oxford at an unusually early age, became a fellow of Magdalen, was recommended to the notice of Henry VII. by Fox, Bishop of Winchester, and was Dean of Lincoln when Henry VIII. succeeded to the throne. With the young king Wolsey's influence was from the first great, and gradually became paramount. He was made Bishop of Lincoln and Archbishop of York. In 1515 he was appointed to the Chancellorship, and, according to the evil custom of the time, received the sees of Durham and Winchester *in commendam* to enable him to bear the great expenses of this office.² In the same year Henry's influence with the Pope procured him promotion to the cardinalate. As a cardinal he took precedence of the primate Warham, and the administration of the Church of England was in his hands from this time till his death. Zealous for the reform of the Church, and perhaps stimulated by the example of Cardinal Ximenes in Spain, Wolsey applied to the Pope for a licence enabling him to conduct a visitation of the English monasteries. Leo X. was somewhat suspicious of Wolsey's fidelity to the Papacy, and tried to put this business into the hands of an Italian, Cardinal Campeggio. The king, however, refused to recognize Campeggio's legatine authority unless Wolsey was associated with him in the commission. Eventually Wolsey was made

¹ The tradition that his father was a butcher originated in a misunderstood witticism of Charles V. Alluding to the execution of Buckingham, the emperor said that the best "buck" in England was destroyed by a "butcher's dog," implying, of course, that Henry was a butcher and Wolsey his obsequious servant.

² Mr. J. H. Blunt remarks that Wolsey's mission to France alone cost him £10,000. Henry recouped him on this occasion by making him Abbot of S. Albans: see Ellis, Orig. Letters, III. i. 274.

CHAP.
VII.

A.D. 1520.

sole legate for a short period. By the special request of the king¹ this period was extended; and at last Clement VII. allowed the legateship to be held for life. After the cardinal's downfall, and when a breach with Rome was in contemplation, Henry had the audacity to fine the English clergy, as rendered liable to a *præmunire* by their acknowledgment of Wolsey's legatine authority. Wolsey hoped to put the monastic system in accord with the spirit of the age by a reorganization which should benefit the universities. The larger houses were merely to be purged of abuses; the smaller he proposed to suppress by drafting their inmates into the larger. The revenues thus gained were to be employed in facilitating education at Oxford and Cambridge. The contrast between this excellent scheme and the work of vandalism subsequently executed by Cromwell at once suggests itself. Twenty of the smaller and really useless houses were actually suppressed in this way by Wolsey, and their revenues² devoted to the foundation of the college now known as Christ Church. Seven professorships, the endowments of which were in later years appropriated by the king, were also established at Oxford. At both universities Wolsey offered liberal patronage to the "New Learning" properly so called, *i.e.* to the study of Greek and patristic theology. In thus befriending the educational centres of the Church, Wolsey seems to have recognized that the real stronghold of the sectarians who were now flocking in from Germany was the ignorance and mental degradation of the English clergy. Both universities were at this time slightly infected with

¹ "Intercessione etiam præfati Henrici Regis."—Brewer's *Calend. State Papers*, 1216; Rymer, xiii. 739.

² S. Frideswide, the largest, together with the adjoining Canterbury Hall, formed the nucleus of the new college.

Lutheranism, and by his rational and lenient treatment of what he believed to be heresy Wolsey showed himself quite beyond his age. Warham in vain¹ urged him to burn the Oxonian Lutherans. The cardinal was content to confute them in argument, and compel their attendance at a holocaust of heretical literature. Protestant books, in fact, rather than Protestant persons, were the victims of Wolsey's orthodoxy. His forcible suppression of these was justified by the irreverent tone of such treatises as "the Babylonish Captivity," and by the scurrilous, even blasphemous, tendency of the subsequent productions of the Protestant press. But it was directly necessitated by the fact that Henry had, notwithstanding Wolsey's remonstrances,² taken the ultra-Roman line in his answer to Luther. Besides facilitating theological studies at the universities, Wolsey proposed to benefit the Church more directly by an extension of the episcopate. The bishops of the Middle Ages were, as we have seen, too much burdened with State duties to do their work as Church officers. Wolsey proposed to relieve the lords spiritual of much of their responsibility by creating twenty-one new bishoprics out of the revenues of useless monasteries. Only six of these were allowed to survive when the administration of the Church passed into the rapacious hands of Cromwell. Another project of Wolsey's was the amalgamation of the two Houses of Convocation. A.D. 1523. This change would have greatly facilitated the despatch of reformatory measures. Wolsey unfortunately

¹ See Warham's letter, Ellis, Orig. Letters, III. i. 239.

² "On June 24, 1518, Secretary Pace had written to the cardinal that the king was pleased with some signs of commendation which Wolsey had at length shown. He is very glad to have noted in your Grace's letters that his reasons be called inevitable, considering your Grace was sometime his adversary therein, and of contrary opinion."—Brewer's Calend. State Papers.

CHAP.
VII.

did not succeed in recommending it to the southern House.¹

Wolsey's
downfall.

Such were the most striking features in Wolsey's administration. It will be convenient to carry on the history of the reforming cardinal to its melancholy close. As early as 1525, Wolsey's unpopularity with a jealous aristocracy seems to have shaken his influence over Henry. Royalty itself had been dissatisfied with Wolsey's way of dealing with the monasteries and the sectaries. No part of the monastic revenue had fed the insatiable cravings of the royal treasury;² and (to borrow the words of the subsequent indictment) Henry considered the cardinal to have been "an impeacher and disturber of due and direct correction of heresies." But the immediate cause of Wolsey's downfall was his inability to further the king's wishes in the matter of the divorce, an inability which Henry was induced by Anne Boleyn to misinterpret. It would have been creditable to Wolsey had the imputation of unwillingness to aid in "the king's matter" been deserved. The one dark blot on his fame is that he unscrupulously devoted his energies to this unworthy cause, and was thus involved in intrigues of disgraceful character. His sin found him out, when it became plain that the Pope had been duping Henry, and that it was not intended that the question should be settled by legates, or in England. Wolsey suffered as the papal legate, though he was in no way accessory to the Pope's policy. He was

Oct. 1529.

¹ The two Houses would have sat together as a legatine synod, with Wolsey for president. The southern Convocation, perhaps, regarded this arrangement as impairing the dignity of the primate of Canterbury.

² "These noble lords," writes the French ambassador, "imagine that the cardinal once dead or ruined, they will incontinently plunder the Church and strip it of all its wealth."—Le Grand, *Histoire du Divorce*, iii. 374.

suddenly deprived of the chancellorship and proceeded against under the "Præmunire" statutes. By the verdict of the law courts, all his possessions were forfeited to the king. Even now it seemed likely that Henry would let him end his days in the retirement of his northern see (Feb. 1530). Wolsey was actually at Cawood Castle, preparing to be enthroned in York Minster, when fortune dealt its last and fatal stroke. He was informed that some secret correspondence with the King of France had been betrayed to Henry, who had put an evil construction on it, and that he was to be taken to the Tower on a charge of high treason. Throughout his reverses Wolsey had displayed little fortitude. He was now so overcome that his health became fatally impaired. He journeyed as far as Leicester Abbey, and there died of a broken heart.

Nov. 30,
1530.

Contemporaneously with Wolsey there had flourished a distinguished group of Reformers of similar type—men who wished to use the intellectual revival in the service of religion, and to purge the Church of the superstitious accretions of a darker age without impairing its catholic character. It is these men we have to thank for that sober and inquiring spirit which infused itself into the assemblies of the sixteenth-century divines, and which made the English Reformation, when not interfered with by the secular power, contrast so favourably with the religious movements on the Continent. Foremost among these men was Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, whose readings on the Greek Testament attracted numerous audiences at Oxford and at his own cathedral, and whose denunciation of such abuses as simony, nepotism, non-resident clergy, and secularized bishops caused considerable sensation. Like

Other
Reformers
at the
univers-
sities.

A.D. 1512

CHAP.

VIL.

A.D. 1518.

minded was Colet's friend Grocyn, who had revived the study of Greek at Oxford and himself given instruction to Erasmus. His pupil's great publication, a printed Greek Testament with a commentary, paved the way for a scientific review of the doctrinal tenets of the Church. Included in this Oxford coterie (in the years 1492-1496) was Thomas More, equally zealous for reform by means of education, and as late as 1516 prepared to advocate, or at least able to conceive of, a toleration to all religious creeds. That such toleration was utterly impracticable in the sixteenth century is shown by the conduct of the author of "*Utopia*" when he afterwards had to deal with heresy as a statesman. Warham, the primate, a prelate whose abilities the genius of the northern archbishop has somewhat eclipsed, was no less desirous of reform. His friend Erasmus writes to him, detailing the most conspicuous abuses in the Church's system, and Warham¹ corresponds with Wolsey on the evils connected with monastic appropriations. Fox, Bishop of Winchester, was in communication with Wolsey on the same subject in 1518. Convinced of the necessity of basing reformation on theological research, this prelate had endowed the College of Corpus Christi, Oxford, for the study of the three sacred languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The pious Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was instrumental in introducing the new studies at Cambridge, and it was at his instigation that Lady Margaret's endowments at both universities were bestowed. Public lectures on the Greek Testament were being given at Cambridge by Dr. Warner and Mr. Stafford. Such influences were radiated from the universities to all parts of England, and everywhere

¹ See Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, III. ii. 30.

men's minds were roused to consider the necessity of a religious reform. But the educational reformers seldom ventured to impugn those papal pretensions which the modern historian regards as the fountain head of all mediæval abuses. The king himself, indeed, had recently silenced all controversy on this topic by his strong assertion of papal supremacy in his treatise¹ against Luther, the treatise which obtained for the English sovereign the title "Defender of the Faith." And the fanaticism and irreverence of the refugee Protestants had done little to attract English sympathies to the cause of anti-papal systems. The irony of fate now ruled that the stoutest champion of the Papacy should sever England from the Roman communion, and that the repulsive episode which terminated his first marriage should inaugurate a purification of the national Church.

Henry appears to have professed no doubts as to the validity of his marriage with Catharine and the legitimacy of the Princess Mary before 1526. By this time the queen, who was much his senior, had lost her beauty. Of her children only one had survived, and that a female, whose claim to the succession would be an anomaly, and whose legitimacy might certainly be questioned by the men who disallowed papal dispensations. In this same year Henry's affections were undoubtedly attracted by Anne Boleyn, a lady of the queen's retinue. It will be unnecessary here to ask which of these considerations first suggested to the king the idea of a divorce. It will be sufficient to remark that Henry's conduct throughout the proceedings was disgustingly brutal, on the most favourable assumption.

The divorce
question.

¹ *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, printed in 1521.

CHAP.
VII.

The "king's matter" agitated Europe for about five years, and involved a series of political complications and discreditable intrigues. These also we cannot investigate fully in such a work as this. We content ourselves with indicating what appear to be the prominent features in the episode, and treating it in its relation to ecclesiastical history. The ground on which Henry claimed a divorce was that a marriage with a brother's widow was prohibited by God's law, and could not be legalized by any papal dispensation. Still more irregular was such a marriage if the previous union had been consummated, as Henry argued that of Catharine and Prince Arthur had been. It seems that Wolsey's services were enlisted on the side of the king before the end of 1526, and that in May, 1527, he thought to settle the question offhand by pronouncing the divorce himself in his capacity as papal legate. This proceeding was forbidden by Pope Clement VII., who was a prisoner in the hands of the Emperor Charles, Catharine's nephew. Counsel was now taken with several bishops, theologians, and doctors of law, but rather with the view of vindicating the king, and propping an unpopular cause with respectable names, than of obtaining a final verdict. Thus early¹ a course had been suggested which was adopted at Cranmer's recommendation two years later, viz. that the question

- at issue should be submitted for decision to the universities. Wolsey, against whom Anne Boleyn had conceived a violent prejudice, knew that his only hope of retaining court favour lay in a zealous advocacy of Henry's interests at Rome. Twice his negotiations were foiled, when seemingly on the verge of success, by the artifices of the shifty Pope, who dared not offend

Result of
negotia-
tions with
Rome.

¹ See J. H. Blunt, *The Reformation*, pp. 129, 130.

the Emperor Charles. In 1528 a third attempt was made. Dr. Fox and Dr. Gardiner were sent to bring from Clement a commission empowering Wolsey and Campeggio (a cardinal who was known to the king, and who held the English bishopric of Salisbury) to act as his representatives, and give a final judgment on the question in a legatine court. After great difficulties had been surmounted, this court was formally sanctioned; and before it Henry and Catharine were cited in the hall of Blackfriars Palace (May 31, 1529). The injured queen, arguing her cause in person, thought it best to repudiate the authority of the court, and make a formal appeal to the Pope himself. The legates pronounced her contumacious, and continued the sessions. On June 28 Catharine's cause was defended by Bishop Fisher, who argued the validity of the marriage with an earnestness which was never forgiven by Henry. Fisher stood almost alone in his opposition to the king's project: More was tongue-tied by his hopes of office; other leading men had been persuaded or silenced by Henry's machinations. Suddenly it came out that Campeggio had been privately instructed by Clement not to decide the question in England. On July 23 he adjourned the court, and it was understood that Henry was to be cited to Rome, and a new trial instituted. The proceedings in the legatine court had only been sanctioned to gain time. The anger of the disappointed monarch was excusable. We have told how it was wreaked upon Wolsey, who had really been duped as completely as the king himself. The cardinal was deprived of the Great Seal this autumn, the new Chancellor being Sir Thomas More. This autumn also saw the initiation in Parliament of measures inimical to the Pope and the ecclesiastics (who were supposed

CHAP.
VII.

Oct. 1529.

The appeal
to the
universi-
ties.
A.D. 1530.

to be partisans of Wolsey)—measures which quickly brought England to the first landmark in the Reformation period, the formal repudiation of all papal pretensions. The progress of these measures will be considered below. Confining ourselves to the matter of the divorce, we notice the appearance of an adviser hitherto unknown, but destined to play as important a part in English history as Wolsey himself. Gardiner and Fox were accompanying the king on a progress, when they chanced to meet with Dr. Cranmer, fellow¹ of Jesus College, Cambridge, at Waltham, and converse with him on the great question of the day. Dr. Cranmer, although little known in Cambridge,² and certainly not ranking high among men of learning, possessed a considerable knowledge of law and some natural acumen. Like the rest of the world, he had followed the progress of the “king’s matter” with interest. In his conversation with Gardiner and Fox he suggested that the opinions of the universities should be taken, and the matter then be decided in an English court. This counsel was reported to the king. It at once took his fancy; for the universities and courts of England could probably be coerced to give a favourable decision. Cranmer was ordered to write a book expressing his views, and was afterwards sent to Rome, probably to broach the new expedient to the Pope. Thence he journeyed to the various Italian universities, to secure verdicts on Henry’s behalf. The king’s application to the universities was accompanied with bribes;

¹ Cranmer’s marriage with his first wife had not lost him his fellowship. She died within the twelvemonth, and he claimed a right to be reinstated.

² “For a quarter of a century he was resident in Cambridge—twenty-five years of excitement, of reform, and of progress: and yet we can only remark and lament that among the distinguished men of the university the name of Cranmer does not appear.”—Hook’s *Archbishops*.

and Orleans, Paris, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, Padua, and Bologna pronounced that Henry's marriage was against God's law, and that the Pope had no power to sanction it by dispensation. But the English universities were less amenable to persuasion than had been expected. Cambridge yielded to menaces, but only acknowledged the illegality of such a marriage "when the matrimony had actually been consummated."¹ Oxford, still grateful to her benefactor Wolsey, made a much bolder stand. In fact, the desired response could only be secured by manipulating Convocation. The king's party were summoned to vote without the knowledge of the opposition. And even then the illegality of Henry's marriage was voted in the same terms as at Cambridge. A servile Parliament was now incited to demand from the Pope a declaration that the marriage was null, on the ground that the universities had so decided, and to reproach him for his delay in the matter (July, 1530). The Pope replied rebuking the Parliament for its audacity. This reply elicited a royal proclamation which made it penal to introduce bulls from Rome (Sept. 19, 1530). The Houses of Convocation were intimidated by a preposterous threat of prosecution for having acknowledged Wolsey's legatine authority. They appear to have voted the nullity of Henry's marriage in terms less equivocal than those adopted by the universities. The death of Warham (Aug. 1532) enabled Henry to put the finishing stroke to the business. Passing over Gardiner and other deserving ecclesiastics, Henry conferred the primacy on the new Cambridge luminary. Thomas

Cranmer
becomes
primate.

¹ "Respondemus . . . quod ducere uxorem fratris mortui sine liberis, cognitam à priori viro per carnalem copulam, nobis Christianis hodie est prohibitum jure divino ac naturali."—Lamb's *Corpus Christi Documents*, p. 21.

CHAP.

VII.

March 1533.

Cranmer was nominated by the Crown, and dutifully elected by the monks of Canterbury. He took the necessary oath of obedience to Rome (presumably with a secret reservation), and thus obtained the bull of consecration and pallium, which were still considered essentials.

And decides the question.

Convinced that the new primate would have no scruple about pronouncing the divorce, Henry anticipated this formality by privately marrying Anne Boleyn at the end of 1532. Cranmer made a parade of a second appeal to Convocation, and of a petition to Henry, asking leave to "proceed to the final determination" of his cause. The king was pleased to grant the request of his "most humble orator and bedeman." Cranmer held a court at Dunstable, pronounced the queen to be *contumax* for refusing to appear, and gave sentence that it was not within the power of a Pope to license a marriage with a brother's widow (May 23). A week later he pronounced at Lambeth the validity of Henry's private marriage with Anne Boleyn. The new queen was crowned on June 1, and on September 5 gave birth to the Princess Elizabeth. The Pope had meantime annulled Cranmer's sentence, and threatened the king with excommunication. On March 23, 1534, the long-delayed papal verdict found utterance. Clement declared that the marriage with Catharine was valid, and that Henry could have no other wife while she lived.

Anti-papal legislation.

We must now turn our attention to the ecclesiastical legislation of the celebrated "Reformation Parliament" (1529-1536). Wolsey's downfall had been hailed with joy by both Houses. There was much ill feeling at this time between clergy and laity, and as the whole body of ecclesiastics was supposed to be implicated in

the disgrace of the favourite, the winter of 1529 was thought a fit season for introducing measures to their detriment. Three bills of such tendency were passed. The fees charged in the bishops' courts for probate of wills were cut down by the first; mortuary fees by the second; the third forbade clerics to obtain from the Pope licences to hold a plurality of benefices. This bill in no way prohibited pluralities; it merely made the king the fountain-head of the iniquity for the future, instead of the Pope. The same tendency is observable in many other reformatory measures of this Parliament, which, it will be borne in mind, was well stocked with holders of offices under the Crown. We have already mentioned the proclamation of Sept. 19, 1530, which forbade the introduction of Roman bulls. It may appear somewhat inconsistent that Cranmer, two years afterwards, applied to the Pope for a bull to sanction his consecration. But it was important that no one should be able to dispute the title of the metropolitan whose business it was to pronounce the divorce; and even at this date the rupture with Rome was not considered final.

Papal
licences
and bulls
prohibited.
A.D. 1529.

Other and more important measures, however, were preparing men for a final severance from Rome during the years 1530-1534. The most remarkable of these was the Act which vested the supremacy of the English Church in the sovereign. We have already related that the clergy were punished for accepting Wolsey's legatine authority, it being argued that they were thus accessory to his supposed misdemeanours. Judges were found who ruled that for this offence the whole body of the clergy were liable to the penalties of the "Præmunire" statute; in other words, that their liberties and possessions were entirely at the mercy of the king.

The king's
eccle-
siastical
supremacy.

CHAP.
VII.

To purchase the royal pardon the Houses of Convocation paid an enormous sum of money. They were told that in the preamble to the Act granting this payment a form must be introduced asserting that the sovereign was supreme head of the English Church. The words suggested by Henry were, "the English Church, of which the king alone is protector and supreme head." This wording appeared to the clergy objectionably vague, if not irreverent. It certainly might be construed as giving the sovereign the powers hitherto vested in the pontiff, and though most of the clergy were inclined to renounce Roman supremacy, none wished for a Pope at home in the person of Henry VIII. To allay their fears, Henry disclaimed all pretence to interfere with the spiritual functions of the clergy, or disparage the Apostolical succession. He only insisted that the head of a Christian state must be the head of its Church also. As the view was expressed afterwards by its champion Gardiner, Henry claimed to be "a prince of his whole people, not of a part of it," and to "govern them in all things, not in some only; and as the people constitute the Church of England, so he must needs be the supreme head of the Church, as he is the supreme head of the people."¹ Cranmer did his best to expound this view to Convocation. Still the members, especially those of the Lower House, were dissatisfied. They insisted on a qualifying clause, "*quantum per Christi legem licet etiam* supremum caput,"² and Henry had to be content with this modification of the title. To the "Reformation Parliament," however, the maintenance of the liberties of the Church was a matter

Feb. 1531.

¹ Gardiner, *De vera obedientia*.² "Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus."—Wilkins, *Conc.*, iii. 725.

of small importance. When the claim to supremacy was embodied in an Act of Parliament in 1534, the qualifying clause was omitted. The "Act of Supremacy" was succeeded by an Act yet more disgraceful to the national representatives. This made non-recognition of the new title punishable with death. It declared it to be treason "to imagine, invent, practise, or attempt any bodily harm" against any of the royal family, or "to deprive any of them of their dignity, title, or name." The "Treason Act," as it is called, was apparently devised by Henry to bring to the scaffold More and Fisher, of whose fate we shall speak presently. It was repealed by 1 Edw. VI. c. 12. The "Act of Supremacy" was repealed in the first year of Mary, and never resuscitated. Under Elizabeth, who would not accept a more pretentious title than "Supreme Governor of the Church," an Act was passed which centred in the Crown all *corrective* jurisdiction for the punishment of "errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, etc." Such jurisdiction had really always been a constitutional prerogative of the Crown, though in recent times it had been invaded by papal pretensions. But Henry claimed, and by the servility of Parliament was enabled to exercise, a *directive* jurisdiction, or power to give orders to the clergy in matters of doctrine, discipline, and practice. And the same claim was made by those who represented the Crown in the reign of Edward VI. The mismanagement of the Church in which this claim at last resulted so disgusted England, that on Edward's death it was prepared to put Roman supremacy again on its trial rather than tolerate a continuance of the lay papacy. With regard to the fine demanded of the clergy, it is to be noticed that the payment made by the Canterbury Convocation alone amounted to a million and a half of

Nov. 1534.

CHAP.
VII.

modern money. The representatives of the laity were, of course, equally liable to a *præmunire*, since all England had recognized Wolsey's legatine authority. But it was only the clergy whom Henry dared to despoil. From the Commons he received a grovelling apology for their fictitious offence, and with this he professed himself satisfied.¹

The Commons extort the "submission of the clergy."

May, 1532.

The next reformatory measure came from the Commons, who, on March 18, 1532, petitioned the king for relief from divers clerical exactions, and especially complained of being subject to canons which had never received assent of Parliament. The king was thus induced to send to the Houses of Convocation three Articles for signature, viz. (1) No constitution or ordinance shall be hereafter enacted by the clergy without the king's consent; (2) The canons are to be reviewed by a committee of thirty persons, who shall abrogate therein whatever "is prejudicial to the king's prerogative and onerous to his Highness's subjects;" (3) All such canons as the committee approve of shall be binding when ratified by the king. The third of these Articles was rejected by Convocation, acting under the influence of Bishop Fisher. Their acceptance of the other two was embodied in a subsequent Act of Parliament (January, 1534), called the "Statute of the Submission of the Clergy." This enacted that sixteen men of both Houses of Parliament and sixteen of the clergy should be named by the king to review the canons. It also ordered that henceforth all convocations should be called by the king's writ² (instead of by the writ of the archbishop), and that nothing should be done therein without the king's licence.

¹ See Amos, Statutes of Henry VIII., p. 57.

² By an unconstitutional refusal of this writ the anti-Church administration of George I. was able to suppress the Church's representative body.

We next notice the statute prohibiting the payment of annates to Rome. This measure originated in a petition of Convocation in 1531. This petition is remarkable as proving that the idea of separation from Rome was not unacceptable to the clergy; indeed, that the first suggestion of separation came from them. How impoverishing the impost of annates was to the Church may be gathered from the fact that a newly appointed bishop was not only charged with fees for papal bulls before he could be consecrated, but also had to pay in advance the whole of his first year's income. Convocation prayed the King that this impost should be abolished, and that if the Pope offered opposition, "forasmuch as S. Paul willeth us to withdraw ourselves from all such as walk inordinately, it may please the king's most noble majesty to ordain in the present Parliament that then *the obedience of him and his people be withdrawn from the see of Rome.*" This petition was immediately followed by an Act of Parliament¹ ordering that payment of annates should cease, and that the Pope should only receive a payment of five per cent. on the income of the see, as an acknowledgment for the requisite bulls; and if the Pope should resist this measure and refuse bulls for consecration, then it should "be lawful for the bishops to be consecrated without them, and for the clergy to minister all manner of sacraments and sacramentals, any excommunication, interdiction, or inhibition of the Pope notwithstanding."

Here again, however, we meet with a testimony that these reformatory measures were all subsidiary to the divorce business. This statute was not to be ratified by the king till Easter, 1533. It was doubtless levelled *in terrorem*, as a method of coercing the Pope to pronounce the desired sentence.

CHAP.
VII.

Annates,
etc., pro-
hibited at
the
instance of
Convoca-
tion.

¹ 23 Hen. VIII. c. 20.

CHAP.

VII.

"Statute
for the
Restraint
of Ap-
peals."

Still more apparent was Henry's motive when the Parliament was inspired to pass the "Statute for the Restraint of Appeals" (Feb. 1533). In this statute it is alleged that England is composed of a temporality and a spirituality, each competent to judge its own causes. Yet, despite the prohibitions of former kings, appeals have been made to the see of Rome in *causes of matrimony* and others, which have delayed and defeated justice. For the future all such causes are to be decided within the kingdom and in the several courts to which they belong.¹ Any spiritual person who shall refuse to execute the sentence of these courts shall be imprisoned or fined. Those who introduce censures from Rome shall be liable to the penalties already provided by the statute 16 Rich. II. Appeals are to be made from the archdeacon to the bishop, or from him to the archbishop or Dean of Arches. Here the right of appeal shall end, save in the case of the king and his heirs, who may appeal from the archbishop to the Upper House of Convocation. Thus was new machinery provided for effecting the divorce, in case the Pope should continue obdurate. It was by virtue of this statute that Cranmer actually took upon himself to give judgment in this matter in the following May.

Negotia-
tions with
the Pope
resumed
to no
purpose.

All these reformatory measures were wellnigh cancelled in the winter of this year. Francis, King of France, mediated between Henry and the Pope. An arrangement was pending that the former should give up all measures for a severance from Rome, and the Pope

¹ Spiritual causes, it will be seen, are strictly confined to the spirituality "which," says the preamble, "always hath been reported and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number it hath been always thought and is at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts." We need not point out how utterly opposed to this principle is the practice of the present times.

should allow the divorce case to be reconsidered by impartial judges at Cambrai. Henry's assent was to reach the Pope by a certain day. The English courier was despatched with the concession required, but failed to arrive in time.¹ Pressed by the Emperor Charles, and ignorant of Henry's acquiescence, the Pope took the fatal step by passing that sentence of March 23 of which we have made mention. The rupture was completed in the following year, when a new Pope, Paul III., was roused by the unjust executions of More and Fisher to pronounce sentences of excommunication and deposition against Henry VIII., and to absolve all his subjects from their allegiance. Against such hostility, however, England was forearmed by the statutes we have enumerated.

But a few more measures were necessary to re-establish the independence of the English Church. One of them was an Act prohibiting papal interference in appointments to bishoprics. The "Statute of Provisors" and other Acts of recent reigns had invalidated the papal claim to nominate to English bishoprics; and of late years the usual method of filling up a vacant see had been that which obtains now. A *congé d'élire* was given to the diocesan chapter, but was really made a legal fiction by the sovereign's prerogative of nomination. But even down to the date of Cranmer's consecration papal bulls were thought necessary to give final confirmation, and the Pope thus had it in his power to invalidate the sovereign's appointment. This power was taken away by an Act of 1533, which required that no person shall "henceforth be presented to the Bishop of Rome, nor apply for bulls from him," and that the archbishop and bishops shall

Papal
inter-
ference in
bishoprics
prohibited.

¹ See Hubert's Henry VIII.; Kennett, ii. pp. 170-173.

CHAP.
VII.

The separation is accomplished, the clergy acquiescing.

at once consecrate the nominee of the king and chapter, "giving and using to him pall, and all other benedictions, without applying for them to the see of Rome."¹

The supremacy had as yet only been sanctioned by Convocation; now, expressed in unequivocal terms, it was embodied in an Act of Parliament. Before this was done the Convocations and universities, and even the regular clergy, had spontaneously repudiated the Pope's pretensions to authority in our Church, declaring that the Bishop of Rome had "no greater jurisdiction" in this kingdom "than any other foreign bishop"² (spring and summer, 1534). By virtue of his new title Henry had charged the prelates to see that the name of the Bishop of Rome was struck out of all manner of "oraisons, rubricks, canons of mass books, etc." The mandate was cheerfully complied with, and the bishops were for the most part zealous in urging the clergy to preach about the supremacy of the sovereign and "his just cause of matrimony." Thus was the first stage in the Reformation reached, and a constitutional change established which made the English Church independent of Rome.

¹ This statute was supplemented by 26 Hen. VIII. c. 14, "For the Nomination of Suffragans and Consecration of them." Twenty-six towns are herein mentioned as to be accounted suffragan sees, and the regulations for the appointment of their bishops are laid down. This Act is still in force. It is highly discreditable to our episcopate that until quite recently there was little thought of using what in thinly populated mediæval England was always a recognized part of the Church's machinery.

² See Wilkins, *Conc.*, iii. 769, 782, 783; and Rymer, xiv. 493. How general this repudiation was is shown by Wharton's statement, that in his time there were in the Exchequer at least 175 instruments disowning papal jurisdiction. These contained the subscriptions of all the bishops, chapters, monasteries, colleges, hospitals, etc., of thirteen dioceses, and he knew where the subscriptions of the remaining dioceses were to be found: see Mr. J. H. Blunt, *The Reformation*, p. 275.

CHAPTER VIII.

Henry VIII.—continued.

A.D. 1534–1547.

Two distinguished malcontents—Implicated by Elizabeth Barton—And disposed of under the “Treason Act”—Careers of More—And Bishop Fisher—Cromwell in the ascendant (1530–1540)—His history—His scheme for spoiling the monasteries—Possible arguments in its defence—Precedents—Detailed account of the scheme—Its execution—Suppression of the smaller houses—Second visitation—Enforced resignation of the larger houses—The “Pilgrimage of Grace”—Third and final visitation—Fate of the ejected—*Ex post facto* Act of 1539—Vandalism—How the spoil was spent—Effect on the House of Lords and the cathedrals—The loot at Canterbury—Henry excommunicated—Progress of Reformation—State of parties—The foreign Protestants and Henry—The Ten Articles passed—Progress of Reforming measures—Royal injunctions—Proceedings in Convocation—The “Bishops’ Book”—More royal injunctions—The open Bible—Foreign Protestants again at Henry—The King no Protestant—Religious persecutions—A retrospect—Hunn and turbulent Protestantism in 1515—Why ultra-Protestants were tolerated from 1534–1539—But persecuted from 1529–1534—Instances—The sop to the Protestant faction—Romanists are the only sufferers from 1534 to November, 1538—The Six Articles of 1539—This Act not often enforced—Fall of Cromwell—Henceforward both extremes suffer—But an orderly Reformation is continued—The “King’s Book”—Purgation of devotional offices—English Litany and King’s Primer—The “Book of Homilies.”

To most persons, whether lay or clerical, the religious changes were satisfactory. Two important exceptions must be noticed. Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher were known to sympathize with the partisans of Queen Catharine; they were also averse to the royal supremacy. For the former cause they had been marked out for destruction by the king; their scruples about forswearing their allegiance to the Pope were now made a means to ensnare them. Already they had

Two distinguished malcontents,

CHAP.

VIII.

Implicated
by Elizabeth
Barton,
A.D. 1533.

been imperilled by alleged implication in the affair of Elizabeth Barton, the nun of Kent. This unfortunate person had had her mind upset, it seems, by the subject of the queen's wrongs—a cause which had many adherents among the middle and lower classes. During her fits of hysteria she was wont to utter strange sayings, which the clergy in the neighbourhood passed off as prophecies with a view to gain.¹ Archbishop Warham and Bishop Fisher both believed in the inspiration of the girl. More had an interview with her, but refused to hear her revelations when he found they bore on the great political question. She was led by her employers to utter predictions of the misfortunes which should befall the king if he persisted in divorcing Catharine. This caused a sensation, and in June, 1533, Cranmer thought it necessary to investigate the matter. The nun, the parish priest, and five monks were apprehended and examined; and torture revealed the existence of a plot to place the Princess Mary on the throne. The names of Fisher and More were mentioned in this worthless confession. Barton was hanged with her six clerical adherents; Fisher and More were reserved to be the victims of a more elaborate process. To the "Act of Succession," which made Anne Boleyn's children the lawful heirs to the crown, was attached, on the sole authority of the king, a form of oath to be taken by the leading persons in the State. This oath involved a repudiation of the authority of all foreign potentates, despite of any oath made to the contrary in former time. To More and Fisher, who were known to be maintainers of the papal supremacy,

¹ Or perhaps to serve political ends. Dr. Bocking, of Canterbury, and Richard Masters (the incumbent of Aldington, Joan's parish) appear to have been the chief agents.

this oath was immediately offered. Both professed their inability to take it; they were consequently committed to the Tower. In the autumn of 1534 the "Treason Act" was brought in to ensure their destruction. Refusal to repudiate the Pope might be construed as "imagining" to the disparagement of the king's titles. The execution of ten of the monks of Charterhouse for their inability to forswear papal supremacy was a presage of the fate awaiting these more distinguished culprits. Nevertheless their case was not proceeded with till Pope Paul III., in May, 1535, drove Henry to fury by making Fisher a cardinal. They were then tried, condemned, and beheaded.

CHAP
VIII.

And dis-
posed of
under the
"Treason
Act."
A.D. 1535.

We have already noticed More as one of the educational reformers. He had attained eminence as a lawyer and statesman, had been Speaker of the Commons, and in 1529 was invested with the Chancellorship, a dignity seldom conferred on a layman. Though a reformer, he was strongly opposed to the Protestant systems, and not only wrote treatises exposing their antinomian tendency, but suppressed the circulation of their literature with great severity. Among the works prohibited by More was Tyndale's translation of the New Testament,¹ which he considered inaccurate, and likely to cause ill feeling among the lower classes. The Chancellor declared, however, that when the anti-Church literature had been suppressed, a translation of the Scripture should be made by

Career of
More,

¹ Printed at Cologne in 1525. To arrest its circulation Warham had unwisely bought up a whole edition. The prejudice against unauthorized translations of Scripture has been already alluded to. Tyndale's "prologues" and glosses (the former more bulky than the translation itself) did not tend to alter the opinion of the authorities. It is noteworthy that in some of Tyndale's editions (1531 and 1534) there occurs a wilful mutilation of the passage, 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14, which teaches submission to civil authorities. The words "whether it be to the king as supreme" are omitted.

CHAP.
VIII.

"great learned and catholick persons." The earliest of More's theological works is the "Supplication of Souls." This was written in answer to the "Supplication of Beggars," a scurrilous production in which Simon Fish had assailed the doctrine of purgatory, and inveighed against the monks as monopolizing all the alms of England. Fish's cause was taken up by John Fryth, an Oxford Lutheran, at this time harboured abroad. Fryth was imprudent enough to return shortly afterwards to England. He was apprehended¹ by More's agents, and brought before Archbishop Cranmer and other prelates, who delivered him to the secular power to be burnt (July, 1533). With Robert Barnes, another refugee, More disputed on the nature of the Church. Tyndale himself was attacked by More in his "Dialogue," and a controversy ensued, in which his adversary's antinomianism and denial of sacramental grace gave More a strong position. The epitaph which More composed as his own memorial contains the words "*Furibus autem et homicidis, hæreticisque molestus.*" That he thus prided himself on being a persecutor was in accordance with the spirit of the age. It appears, nevertheless, a deplorable inconsistency in a man whose mind had entertained the aspirations of "Utopia."

And Bishop
Fisher.

The pious and self-denying Fisher had been, like More, an educational reformer. The sphere of his labours was Cambridge, where he had been President of Queen's College before his promotion to the episcopate. He had been selected by the Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond, to be her confessor. He persuaded his patroness to endow the foundations of S. John's and Christ's, Cambridge, and the two professorships which still bear her name. Yet for himself

¹ See p. 192.

he refused higher preferment than the poor bishopric of Rochester. Fisher had persistently opposed the divorce scheme, and—partly, perhaps, because he penetrated Henry's motive in introducing ecclesiastical changes—he remained unshaken in his allegiance to the Pope when the other bishops gladly repudiated papal supremacy. Fisher met death with the serenity of a Christian; More, no less sincere in his religious convictions, did himself injustice by affecting on the scaffold the demeanour of a stoic. The death of Fisher afforded intense gratification to Anne Boleyn. The story of Herodias and John Baptist cannot but suggest itself, when we read how Henry's new queen demanded the dissevered head and buffeted the lips that had once protested against her consort's sin.¹

Contemporaneously with Cranmer there emerged from obscurity a man of equal talent, but far less respectable character—Thomas Cromwell. This man headed the political Protestant party for several years, and it is to his influence with the king that the spoliation and destruction of the monastic houses is to be ascribed. Before treating of this discreditable work, the details of Cromwell's career may be summarized for the benefit of the student. He appears to have been born at Putney, of obscure parents, in 1490. His early years were full of strange vicissitudes and gave but scant presage of his future greatness. He is said to have been successively a servant of the Marchioness of Dorset, a common soldier in the Italian army, and a clerk in a merchant's house, first at Venice, then at Antwerp. But the incidents relating to this period of his life are not well authenticated. The first uncontested fact is that he had risen to the condition of a merchant at

Cromwell
in the
ascendant.
A.D. 1530-
1540.

His history.

¹ See J. H. Blunt, *The Reformation*, p. 422.

CHAP.

VIII.

Middleburgh in the year 1512. Before 1520 he had embraced the avocation of a scrivener, with which he combined the lucrative but discreditable business of a money-lender. He became attorney to Cardinal Wolsey before 1528, and appears to have won by his ability the respect and confidence of the great statesman. Though threatened with danger by the impending ruin of Wolsey, he defended his master earnestly and skilfully in the House of Commons. The next we hear of him is that he had passed into the service of Henry, whose talent for discovering serviceable tools had been illustrated but a little while before by his promotion of Cranmer. The scrivener's upward flight was as rapid as that of the Churchman. He was Master of the Jewels in 1532; Chancellor of the Exchequer for life, and a knight in 1533; Master of the Rolls, Secretary of State, and "Vicar-General" in 1534. This newly coined title was exchanged for one equally anomalous—"Vicegerent in Ecclesiastical Causes"—in 1536. For his management of the spoliation of 1535-1539 he appears to have received an enormous honorarium—thirty monastic manors; to these were added the emoluments of the deanery of Wells. The top of the ladder was reached when in 1540 he was made Earl of Essex.

His scheme
for spoiling
the monas-
teries.

Henry had probably cast a greedy eye on the monastic houses long before 1535, when he first proposed their suppression in his Council. The scheme of spoliation was apparently put in shape by the man who afterwards had charge of it—Thomas Cromwell—who had acquired a practical knowledge of the religious houses in serving under Wolsey. Henry's object was doubtless to replenish an exchequer drained by his unbridled profusion and threatened with new calls by the quarrel with the emperor. But he had a pretext in

Wolsey's project for reforming the monasteries, since that statesman had allowed that the smaller houses might well be suppressed. The reasons which influenced Wolsey and other conscientious men in demanding a thorough reform of the monastic houses were probably these.

(a.) *Their uselessness.* The ancient belief that heaven was most easily attained by a life of monastic seclusion had worn itself out. The learning which had once been monopolized by the monks had long found a home in the universities. The manual labour by which the monks had transmitted literature to posterity, was now rendered unnecessary by the invention of printing.

CHAP.
VIII.

Possible
arguments
in its
defence.

(b.) *The laxity of the inmates.* A community whose vocations and very *raison d'être* were thus antiquated would naturally become corrupt. The monk was generally an idle man, and did not pretend to that asceticism which had once been held to justify idleness. Many of the inmates were married; more ought to have been. In some cases, notably at Fountains, Bury, Walden, and Langdon, the superior was a person of profligate habits or unbridled passions, and the subordinates followed his bad example. In many the superior was doubtless elected simply because he was no disciplinarian. Nevertheless, the sweeping charge of immorality so often levelled against the monks and nuns of the sixteenth century was unknown to contemporary censors of any character. Many good men desired a sweeping reform of the religious houses, but they had not discovered what Cromwell's inquisitors reported—that two-thirds of them were defiled by abominable impurities. Such imputations originated with men who were interested in discovering facts to

CHAP.
VIII.

the prejudice of the houses, who showed themselves in other matters glaringly unscrupulous, and who had no time to investigate fairly the scandalous gossip which they reported as matter of fact.

(c.) *Their injurious influence on the Church.* The immunity of the religious houses from episcopal control was calculated to weaken the system of diocesan discipline and aggrandize the see of Rome. The regular clergy had hitherto acknowledged no ecclesiastical authority save that of the Pope, and had often caused great disturbance by the resistance they offered to the diocesans. The system of "appropriations," by which the tithes of benefices belonged to the monastic house and the care of souls to an ill-paid vicar, has been already mentioned. Often, perhaps, as little of the money was spent on the parish churches as under the regime of lay impropiators by which Henry replaced this system.

(d.) *Their injurious influence on the State.* The number of houses was grossly disproportionate to the population; so too were their nominal revenues to the wealth of England. They numbered more than six hundred. It is estimated that they actually enjoyed a tenth of the capital of the country, and that they might be credited with a larger proportion than this but for their practice of giving long leases. Much of this wealth went out of England to meet the exactions of the Pope, and the present relations of England and Rome were incompatible with the continuance of such tribute.

Precedents.

The power of the Crown to dissolve or transform religious corporations had been illustrated by cases occurring in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Knight Templars had been dissolved in 1307, and

a papal bull put their property in the hands of the king for a time. It was finally assigned by an Act of Parliament to the brethren of the Hospital of S. John of Jerusalem. In 1416, again, the war with France suggested the propriety of dissolving the "alien priories" in England. Here also the property was transferred to other foundations. With some of the lands the monasteries of Sheen and Sion were endowed; others were given to New College and Winchester. Neither case afforded a precedent for the alienation of religious property to secular uses.¹ Wolsey, as we have shown, had proposed to treat the smaller monasteries as the "alien priories" had been treated, transferring their endowments to more useful centres of religious education. For this project, besides the cases cited above, he could find precedents in the dealings of Archbishop Chicheley, the founder of All Souls; of Bishop Waynfleet, the founder of Magdalen, Oxford; or of Bishop Alcock, who had recently transformed S. Rhadagund's Nunnery into Jesus College, Cambridge.

After the cardinal's overthrow, Henry had seized on those monastic revenues which had been destined to enrich Oxford. The endowments of the cardinal's colleges and professorships, though subsidized by the fine unjustly wrung from the clergy, only filled the exchequer for a few years. Then the king conferred with his Council as to the propriety of a general spoliation of the monastic houses. To effect this a com-

Detailed
account of
the scheme.

¹ That such alienation was *legal* is, however, hardly deniable. Kennett points out that "according to the most ancient laws of the kingdom," where it could be proved that Church property was applied without regard to "the use, cause, condition, or terms of the primary donation," it lapsed to the heirs of those who had conferred it. And the Crown, of course, had the right to such property, if ownership could not be proved. See Kennett on Appropriations, p. 114.

CHAP.
VIII.

A.D. 1535.

mission was appointed to act under Cromwell. It was to set on foot a visitation, which was to be the basis of a formal report as to the state of the houses. This report was to be laid before Parliament, as a pretext for a Bill of Dissolution. The members of the commission were unscrupulous persons¹ chosen by Cromwell. Leigh, Leighton, London, and Ap Rice were to preside over the visitation of monks and nuns; Richard Thornton, the bishop-suffragan of Dover, over that of the friars. Subordinated to these were several other persons of similar character. Lest the bishops should stop the sacrilegious work which was the real object of this visitation, a most singular use was made of the royal supremacy. Thomas Cromwell was appointed to "treat and examine all causes ecclesiastical" as the king's representative. He had power to nominate persons who should "visit all and singular churches, even metropolitan churches, cathedrals, and collegiate churches, hospitals, and monasteries," and have authority to sequester revenues, make statutes, call synods, hold courts, receive resignations, preside at and direct the elections of prelates, institute and induct into possession of churches, etc. Cromwell's nominees were thus put on the footing of bishops; while the diocesans had their jurisdiction suspended by another instrument, which forbade them "to visit the monasteries, churches, etc., or to exercise any jurisdiction, or in any way to interfere with our general visitation." Cranmer

¹ That they were chosen because unscrupulous can hardly be contested. London had afterwards to do penance for gross immorality, and died a prisoner in the Fleet on the charge of perjury. Leighton, a man of similar character, pandered to the king's vices, and by bribes secured the deanery of York. After his death it was found that he had pawned the cathedral plate. The arrogance and the extortions of Leigh were complained of to Cromwell by one of his fellow-commissioners. On the statements of these and similar persons the oft-cited indictments against the monks are really based.

having acquiesced in this arrangement with his usual complaisance, the visitation of houses with incomes under £200 began. The visitors were ostensibly an inquisitorial body who came with the purpose of compiling a report. They were instructed, however, to put such pressure on the religious corporations as to compel them to resignation. And their more special care was to strip these establishments of the jewels, crosses, and ecclesiastical ornaments with which the piety of former years had enriched them. These were packed and forwarded to London. The visitation began in October, 1535. Absurd though it may appear, three months were considered sufficient time for the compilation of a report on the state of the religious houses, and in February, 1536, a Bill was brought in for the dissolution of those with incomes under £200 a year. The "Black Book," as the report of the visitors was called, was, of course, filled with such scandalous stories about the lives of the monks and nuns as could be raked up in the neighbourhood of the various houses. It is not much to be regretted that it was destroyed in Queen Mary's time; had it survived its testimony would be worthless. It served, however, to give a high moral tone to proceedings of which royal cupidity was the true explanation. Prudence suggested that the larger houses should not yet be attacked, and the abbots in the Upper House seemed to have sacrificed their weaker brethren in the hope of thus saving themselves. They offered no resistance to the Bill of February, 1536. The revenues of the three hundred and seventy-six smaller houses thus lapsed to the king, to be disposed of "to the honour of God."

CHAP.
VIII.

Its execution. Suppression of the smaller houses.

By the "Act of Suppression" and the previous loot Henry appears to have secured about a million and a

CHAP.
VIII.

Second
visitation.
Enforced
resigna-
tion of the
larger
houses.

quarter of modern money. A great part of this booty, however, had to be dispersed among the aristocracy to purchase connivance at a more extensive spoliation. A Court of Augmentation was established to gather in the revenues, and a second visitation was undertaken by agents of this court to complete the demolition of the doomed establishments, and to harass the larger houses. Such of these as should resign lapsed, according to the recent Act, to the king. Every effort was made, therefore, to coerce them to resignation. The inmates were freely paid to accuse one another of breaches of discipline,¹ that the reputations of the communities might be disparaged. Temptations of a more hateful character were offered to the nuns with a similar motive. Preachers were sent about the country to defame the monastic establishments in sermons. The gentry were promised and actually given a liberal share of the plunder; the secular clergy were soothed with promises of the rectorial tithes, hitherto held by the monasteries, and really destined to pass into the more tenacious grasp of lay impropiators.

The "Pil-
grimage of
Grace."
A.D. 1536-7.

The progress of this business was delayed by an insurrection, incited perhaps by the expelled regulars, but joined in readily by the lower classes, who were mainly dependent on the religious houses for education, alms, and employment. The "Pilgrimage of Grace" began at Louth in Lincolnshire, and spread throughout the eastern and northern counties. The insurgent forces were headed by Robert Aske, a Yorkshire squire; with him were Lords Darcy and Hussey, and the Archbishop of York. Marching under a standard marked with the five wounds of Christ, the insurgents

¹ See Fuller, Ch. Hist., ii. 215, 216, ed. 1837; and cf. State Papers, Henry VIII., vii. 540.

clamoured for a redress of the Church's wrongs. The chief ground of complaint was, of course, the recent treatment of the religious houses. But the whole ecclesiastical policy of the king was really disparaged by the insurgents. The northern clergy who joined in this movement held a kind of convocation, to condemn the recent measures affecting the Church. They voted that no temporal officer can be supreme head of the Church or have jurisdiction in the same; that the Pope, having been declared head of the Church by Councils, ought to be so regarded; that papal dispensations and indulgences are efficacious; that lands given for pious uses cannot be alienated for secular purposes. In opposition perhaps to the Ten Articles recently accepted by the southern Convocation, they denounced all such as preached against purgatory, pilgrimages, and worshipping of saints and images.

Henry preferred to quell this rebellion by diplomacy of a questionable character. He held out hopes of meeting the demands of the insurgents, and he promised a general pardon. He was thus enabled to secure the persons of the leaders. The undisciplined rabble was then routed, and the royal word was dishonoured by the execution of Darcy, Hussey, Aske, twelve abbots, and many clergy. The insurrection was a pretext for heavier pressure on the surviving corporations. A third visitation was instituted in the summer of 1537, to charge them, wherever possible, with complicity in the late insurrection, and to induce them by systematic intimidation to a so-called voluntary surrender. Great was the satisfaction of the inquisitors, and less harsh the fate of their victims, if the latter could be coerced to attest the justice of the spoliation by putting their names to ready-made confessions of

Third and
final visita-
tion.

CHAP.
VIII.Fate of the
ejected. ...Ex post
facto Act
of 1539.

misdemeanour and immorality. Such compliance was rewarded by an augmentation of the miserable pension with which the ejected regulars were turned adrift. On the other hand, it was easy to entangle such as were not amenable to persuasion within the meshes of the law. It was held treasonable for an abbot to conceal the property of his own church. For thus attempting to save Glastonbury from spoliation, Abbot Whiting, a man of blameless character, was slaughtered, or, as Cromwell words it in his own memorandum on the subject, it was decided that "he should be tried and also be executed." It is satisfactory to find that in some few cases adequate provision was made for the victims of royal avarice. Tewkesbury, where the abbot's income was to be £266 13s. 4d., and that of the monks at least £6 13s. 4d., appears to have fared best of all the religious houses. Some abbots had as little as £6; and not a few monks appear to have been compelled to begin life afresh with a single payment of forty shillings and a priest's gown. The pension of the nuns was usually less than that of the monks. What the trials of some of these disbanded regulars must have been may easily be conceived. A testimony to their misery may be found in the sanguinary Acts against mendicancy which shortly followed. So successful was this final visitation that there was no occasion for any Act suppressing the large houses. The previous Act had given to the Crown all such monasteries as should resign within the twelve months following; the only legislation now required was an Act legalizing the plunder of the houses which had resigned after the expiration of the twelvemonth. This *ex post facto* sanction was given by an Act passed in the spring of 1539, which is sometimes mis-termed the second "Act of Suppression."

The barbarous treatment of the edifices and their costly accessories, which was the immediate result of the visitation, has been alluded to. The bells, glass, lead, pavement, timber, and carved work were sold for a mere song, or were left to the mercy of the rabble. The jewels, moneys, and plate were carefully packed up to become the prey of robbers of a higher class. Some pains were taken to prevent the utter loss of the literary treasures of the monasteries. John Leland, the king's antiquary, and John Bale were engaged at this time in making extracts from the chronicles and other manuscripts of the monks.

CHAP.
VIII.

Vandalism.

Nevertheless the damage done to the cause of English literature¹ in this season of spoliation was incalculable. It must also be added that with the monasteries the ecclesiastical style of art perished—architecture sustaining a blow which it has never recovered,—and that the ruin of the great educational nurseries necessitated that decadence at the universities which was so bitterly deplored by Latimer.

Mr. Perry estimates that the gross gain which accrued to the Crown by the dissolution of the monasteries was, in modern value, £38,400,000. Even in view of the reckless extravagance of Henry's court, the system of bribery which the scheme entailed,² and the king's habit of lavishing gifts of preposterous value on the favourites of the hour, the fate of these enormous revenues cannot be accounted for. The portion ceded, by way of compensation, to the causes of philanthropy

How the
spoil was
spent.

¹ See Bale's own account in the Declaration upon Leland's Journal, 1549.

² Lord Audley, the Chancellor, received eight monastic demesnes; Lord Clinton, thirteen; Cranmer, eight (some of them for poor relations and dependents); Lord Russell, three of great value; Lord Parr, four; the Duke of Norfolk, thirteen; the Duke of Northumberland, eighteen; the Duke of Somerset, thirteen; the Duke of Suffolk, thirty.

CHAP.
VIII.

and religion was scanty indeed. Of revenues so spent the following is the account:—S. Bartholomew's and S. Thomas's Hospitals were allowed to remain endowed, for the use of the poorer classes. Some of the monasteries were turned into collegiate churches (*e.g.* Ripon, Beverley, and Manchester); others survived to be converted into parish churches, as S. Albans, Croyland, Stow, Malvern, etc. In most of these cases, some part at least of the ancient revenues was usually retained as an endowment. At Oxford, Wolsey's splendid plans with respect to Christ Church were completed in a meagre fashion. Cambridge, more fortunate, gained the magnificent institution of Trinity College. Six new sees were founded and inadequately endowed, viz. Oseney (near Oxford), Peterborough, Bristol, Gloucester, Chester, and Westminster. The last-named became the prey of Edward's Council, and was never restored to its episcopal dignity.

Ejection
the House
of Lords
and the
cathedrals.

The dissolution of the monasteries necessarily involved a complete change in the character of the House of Lords. Hitherto the majority of the members had been spiritual lords, since the abbots and priors who had seats were far more numerous than the bishops. The ejection of these practically changed the House from an ecclesiastical to a lay assembly. The cathedral system was also affected by the downfall of the monks. In eight of the cathedrals—Canterbury, Winchester, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Worcester, Carlisle, and Rochester—the chapters were composed of regular clergy. As the regulars had always professed to be independent of episcopal authority, this organization was necessarily detrimental to diocesan discipline. In some cases, moreover, the secular clergy had really a prior claim to the cathedral emoluments, the regulars

having succeeded in ousting their brethren in the Norman period, when the monastic system was in the ascendant. On these grounds the establishment of secular canons in such towns, and the conversion of the cathedral priories into colleges, might be defended.

CHAP.
VIII.

The restoration of a secular chapter at Canterbury, where the monks of Christ Church had held sway since the Conquest, was preceded by a curious manifestation of hostility against the martyred Thomas Becket. Hitherto no English saint had received so much veneration as S. Thomas of Canterbury. His influence in the next world was attested by miracles, his popularity in this by a shrine which literally blazed with gold and precious stones. But to Henry the canonized primate was odious, as personifying the triumph of the Church over the throne. "Thomas Becket" was gravely cited by the Attorney-General to answer a charge of treason, contumacy, and rebellion. Thirty days in succession a pursuivant read this summons at the celebrated shrine. Neglecting to regard it, the contumacious saint was deprived of his festival, special office, and other commemorative honours, and the priceless treasures of his shrine were appropriated by the king (August, 1538). This proceeding caused great indignation in the papal court. A sentence of excommunication against Henry had been pending ever since the execution of Bishop Fisher, but the intervention of the King of France had stayed its publication. Paul III. now issued the bull declaring Henry excommunicated and deposed, and his subjects absolved from their allegiance.

The loot at
Canter-
bury
A.D. 1538.

Henry
excom-
municated.

We must now resume our account of the religious Reformation of this reign. The constitutional change which emancipated England from the tyranny of the

Progress of
Reforma-
tion.

CHAP.
VIII.

State of
parties.

papal court was, as we have observed, acceptable at first to almost all classes. As to the propriety of making changes in matters of doctrine there was not the same unanimity. And the course of royal policy with reference to the Church becomes henceforth difficult to follow, inasmuch as Henry was induced by interest or religious sympathies to patronize now the men of the Old, now those of the New Learning. An account of the chief agencies which regulated the course of Reformation in this reign will make the events we have to describe more intelligible. (1) On the throne was a man well read in theology, who had a real wish for the Church's welfare, but a stronger wish to enjoy undisputed supremacy and inexhaustible revenues. The party which could best minister to these latter tastes could usually count on securing consideration for its theological tenets. Henry's own views, when not biased, might now be defined as Catholicism without the Pope. He was a strong believer in the efficacy of sacraments, was regular in his attendance at mass, had little sympathy for the new hair-splitting controversies about justification by faith, and was very determined that the modern religionists should not disturb public peace or endanger constituted authority in England, as they had done abroad. (2) The party henceforth known as the men of the "Old Learning" were for the most part prepared to be rid of papal supremacy, provided its repudiation did not lead to precipitate changes in doctrine and discipline. How far reform ought to go they were not agreed. These men were much frightened by Henry's spoliation of the monasteries. Many of them, as we have seen, would now fain retrace their steps, and restore to the Pope the powers which the king had so much abused. Most of them were hence-

forth anti-reformers rather perhaps from caution than conviction. Some, however, became so pronounced in their repudiation of the royal supremacy as to bring on themselves the penalties of the law; and this cause produced more martyrs in England than that of Protestantism. The leading men of this party were Lee, Archbishop of York; Tonsal, Bishop of Durham; Stokesley, Bishop of London; and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. (3) The party of the "New Learning" included many heterogeneous elements. Its most respectable members were men who were actuated by a sincere desire to reform the Church, and who thought this might be done by applying to all the doctrines and practices assailed by Luther the test of Scripture and primitive Confessions. They were prepared to accept whatever changes should be thus sanctioned, but they were for the most part determined not to decatholize the Church in Protestant fashion. They had not, however, a very high idea of the prerogatives of the spirituality, and they did not object when Henry issued licences to bishops, suspended and restored their powers, or obtruded on Convocation a lay "Vicar-General" as president—proceedings which somewhat staggered the men of the Old Learning. At the head of this school were Cranmer, the primate; Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Latimer, Bishop of Worcester; Fox, Bishop of Hereford; and Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester. But the New Learning had also adherents of a very different character. It was disparaged by sectaries and fanatics of the lower orders, whose impatience could not brook the leisurely method of reform contemplated by their ecclesiastical superiors, and whose silly and irreverent tirades on the grave questions at issue frequently brought them to condign punishment. It had also, like the Lollard school, a

CHAP.
VIII.

following of demagogues and socialist agitators, such as reap a harvest off all causes that are subversive of established system. Worst of all, the New Learning had, in the upper classes, champions of the Cromwell type—men who affected anti-Church sentiments with the view of raising themselves to opulence or political importance, and who would pander to Henry's avarice at the expense of the ecclesiastical revenues.

The foreign
Protestants
and Henry.

In 1535–36 Cromwell's machinery for despoiling the monasteries was working well, and the anti-Church party was in high favour at court. The Protestant princes of Germany met at Smalcald to form a league in support of the new religious systems. The English king was, it seems, nearly persuaded to identify his cause with Protestantism by joining in this league. Such a course would probably have necessitated the acceptance of the "Confession of Augsburg." Gardiner was fortunately at hand to insist that union with the Protestants would be derogatory to English independence, and would really impede the desired Reformation. The king gave up this project, but so far deferred to Protestantism as to draw up Articles for the English Church which were partly based on the Augsburg "Confession."

The Ten
Articles
passed.
A.D. 1536.

In the preparation of the Ten Articles the king was helped probably by Cranmer and Fox. Policy or higher motives infused into this formulary a spirit of concession, so that while it was a compliment to the Protestants, it enforced on the conservative party at home nothing which they would deem objectionable. Convocation was at this time sitting, with Cromwell as President of the Upper House, the King having determined that his ignorant "Vicar-General" should have all the honour which Church assemblies had formerly paid to the papal legate *à latere*. To Convocation then

the Articles were sent, and by both Houses they were readily accepted. The Ten Articles may be briefly summarized thus:—

I. The foundations of the faith—are the Scriptures and three Creeds, as interpreted by the four Holy Councils and by approved doctors of the Church. What these interpreters have condemned ought to be reprobated by all clergymen.

II. Baptism—is necessary to salvation, as cleansing from sin and conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost: it ought to be administered to infants.

III. Penance—is a sacrament instituted for the recovery of those who have fallen away after baptism; it requires contrition, confession, and amendment: the absolution is pronounced by the priest on the authority given to him by Christ in the Gospel.

IV. The sacrament of the Altar:—The self-same Body and Blood of the Saviour which were born of the Virgin Mary are declared to be present, under the form of bread and wine, “*vere, substantialiter,¹ et realiter.*”

V. Justification—is said to be “attained by contrition and faith joined with charity for the sake of the merits of Christ’s Passion.”

VI. Images—are useful as helps to prayer, but care must be taken lest the reverence paid to them lead to idolatry; they are not to be censured or presented with offerings.

VII. Saints—are to be honoured, not with the honour due to God, but to the end that Christ may be glorified for the virtues He has planted in them.

VIII. Prayers to saints—are permitted, not because saints can take the place of the One Mediator, but because they can intercede with God on man’s behalf.

¹ The term *substantialiter* implies, of course, the dogma of transubstantiation.

CHAP.
VIII.

IX. Rites and ceremonies—whether as pertains to vestments or to such practices as using candles on Candlemas Day, ashes on the first day of Lent, palms on the last Sunday in Lent, etc., are esteemed useful and laudable, “not as having power to remit sin, but only to stir and lift up our minds to God.”

X. Purgatory :—The place where souls departed abide is not known, “nor the name thereof and kind of pains therein,” but prayers and masses on their behalf are a charitable work, though abused by the Bishop of Rome.

Progress of
Reforming
measures.

This Convocation also ruled that Church holidays had been so multiplied as to conduce to idleness and lewdness rather than real devotion; it therefore abolished many of the minor Church holidays—those especially which fell in the harvest season. It also appointed one day (the first Sunday in October) to be observed as the Feast of Dedication by all churches. In view of the Pope’s proposal to hold a General Council at Mantua in 1537, Convocation voted that though true General Councils were most valuable, a Council summoned “not Christianly and charitably, but for and upon private malice and ambition, or other worldly respects,” was worthless, and that “neither the Bishop of Rome nor any one prince” had power to call a General Council without the express consent of the residue of Christian princes, “and specially such as have *imperium merum*—that is, the whole entire and supreme government and authority over all their subjects.”

The Ten Articles were published by the king as “devised by the kinges highnes majestie to stablyshe Christen quietnes amonge us,” and as “approved by the consent and determination of the holy clergie.” “Christen quietnes” was further insured by an order suspending all clergy, except bishops and cathedral

preachers, from their pulpit duties until Michaelmas. The parish priests were thus prevented from speaking on behalf of the monasteries. By virtue of his supremacy the king issued at the same time a set of "Injunctions" to the clergy. These were ten in number. The clergy were enjoined to preach once a quarter against the Pope; to inform their people as to the new arrangements about holidays, and as to the doctrine of the Ten Articles with respect to ceremonies, saints, and images; to make them learn intelligently the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue; to provide for the proper administration of the sacraments; to live soberly and studiously; to give alms; to tax themselves to provide one exhibition at the universities for every £100 of income; and to expend one-fifth of their benefices on the repair of their chancels and glebe houses.

CHAP.
VIII.

Royal
"Injunctions."
A.D. 1536.

Hitherto the two great parties in Convocation had worked together harmoniously. The insurrection in the north did much to impair this good feeling, and when Convocation met in January, 1537, there was some angry speaking on the subject of the minor sacraments. Cromwell insulted the House by introducing a Scotch Protestant refugee, named Aless or Allen, to act as his spokesman. This person joined in the debate on the first day of session, but his intrusion was not afterwards tolerated.¹ The Reforming party demanded a formulary to take the place of the Ten Articles as an exposition of the Church's faith, this document being considered meagre and unsatisfactory. Application was accordingly made to the king, and a committee was appointed by him in which both parties were fairly represented. It included all the bishops, eight archdeacons, and

Proceedings in Convocation.

The
"Bishops'
Book."

¹ Ellis, Orig. Letters, III. iii. 196-202.

CHAP.
VIII.

seventeen doctors. The important book styled the "Institution of a Christian Man," and in after years known as the "Bishops' Book," was the production of this committee. While this publication was acceptable to the conservative party, it was regarded by the most respectable representatives of the New Learning as carrying the Reformation as far as could be desired, and Latimer expressed a hope when it was finished "that we shall not need to have any more such doings." The "Institution" was an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria, the doctrine of Justification, and the doctrine of Purgatory. In the exposition of the Creed the sectarian view of the Church is indirectly disparaged by the statement that the visible Church consists of all baptized persons, bad and good. Bishops are treated rather as superior members of the priesthood than as belonging to a distinct grade, but the spiritual powers of the clergy are declared to be inherited from Christ and the Apostles. The section which treats of the sacraments declares that "there is a difference in necessity and dignity" between the three sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Altar, and those of Matrimony, Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction. The superiority of the former lies in their being instituted by the Saviour Himself, as absolutely necessary for salvation. But the four others worthily have "the name and dignity of sacraments." The Ave Maria is declared to be not a prayer, but "a hymn, laud, and praise." The sections on Justification and Purgatory are taken from the Ten Articles. The "Institution" was received with satisfaction by the king, and was issued by the royal printer in 1537.

More royal

The new exposition of faith was followed, like the

Articles, by a batch of royal "Injunctions." John Rogers, writing under the pseudonym of Matthew, had lately published an English Bible compiled from the translations of Tyndale and Coverdale. Cranmer approved of this translation, and had petitioned for a licence for "Matthew's Bible," pending the completion of the "Great Bible" by himself and his fellow-commissioners.¹ The new "Injunctions" introduced this work into the churches. It was enjoined that a copy of the Bible should be set up in a convenient place in each church, the parson and parishioners sharing the charges of purchase, and that every man should be "provoked to read the same as the lively Word of God." Readers were to avoid all contention and altercation as to the interpretation, and refer "the explication of obscure places to men of higher judgment in Scripture." This last proviso was not easily enforced, and turbulent and fanatical persons soon began to use the "open Bible" in the cause of disorder. Bishop Bonner declares that, having set up six Bibles in St. Paul's with all due admonitions, he was obliged soon afterwards to remove them, so intolerable was the irreverence and clamour of those who came to study them. The "Injunctions" also give some directions about images and relics which imply a less liberal view of such accessories of worship than was expressed in the Ten Articles. The exposure of many monkish impostures by the recent visitation,

CHAP.
VIII.

Injunctions."
A.D. 1538.

The open
Bible.

¹ In 1530 Henry had conferred with an assembly of learned university men as to the propriety of publishing an English Bible. The assembly decided that it would be better to defer such publication, because of "the malignity of the present time" and "the inclination of the people to erroneous opinions." Convocation, however, in December, 1534, petitioned the king "that the Scriptures should be translated into the vulgar tongue by some honest and learned men, to be nominated by the king, and to be delivered to the people according to their learning." What reply Henry made is not known, but Cranmer is found shortly afterwards dividing the Bible among a committee of learned divines for the purpose of translation.

CHAP.
VIII.

and Henry's desire to exculpate himself for the spoliation of Becket's shrine, are two sufficient reasons for this change of opinion. The "offering of money, candles, or tapers to images or relics, and kissing or licking the same," are deprecated in these "Injunctions," as things "tending to idolatry and superstition;" all images that have received such marks of respect are to be taken down, and, with respect to those that are left, parishioners are to be warned that they are only tolerated "as the books of unlearned men that cannot know letters."

The deputation of foreign Protestants.
A.D. 1538.

It was while Henry was in this mind that the Protestants made another attempt to foist the "Confession of Augsburg" on the Church of England. A deputation of Lutherans arrived in England this summer (1538), and the king allowed them to hold a conference with Cranmer and the liberal bishops. But all hope of a concordat between the two systems was at an end when the foreigners had the boldness to draw up a paper condemning certain practices in the English Church as abuses which must needs be removed. Communion in one kind, private masses, and clerical celibacy were the abuses specified. Henry held pronounced views on all these subjects; and on one of them at least Cranmer should have been conservative, since only a year previously he had officiated at the performance of twelve hundred masses for the soul of Queen Jane. The king henceforth took no pains to conceal his contempt for German principalities and German theology. The Lutheran delegates were assigned such incommodious lodgings and treated with such contumely that they thought it best to return home. Their paper of abuses was answered in vigorous language by Tonstal. A more practical reply was the "Act of Six

Articles" passed in the next year to guard the impugned practices by means of severe penalties. It must be remembered that Henry, though a Reformer, was no Protestant. He found it expedient to league with such men as Cromwell when they could fill his exchequer with the spoils of the monastic houses; but the basis of such union was throughout worldly interest, not religious sympathy. He could deal in Erastian fashion with the Church when it was a question whether he or the Pope should be supreme, but this problem settled, he was prepared to back up the bishops in their attempts to enforce order with all the zeal of a high ecclesiastic. In fact, save when his greed of power or money pulled him in the opposite direction, Henry was a Catholic, of a pronounced type. Like almost all religionists of his day, Catholic or Protestant, he thought it a good work to enforce what he deemed orthodox by means of civil punishments. The present seemed to Henry a convenient occasion for repudiating, by a penal enactment, the Protestant proclivities with which not only foreigners, but even his own minister Cromwell, had apparently credited him. But before we describe the "Act of Six Articles," it will be well to glance back and consider how the two great parties had hitherto fared with respect to persecution.

The ultra-Reforming party at the beginning of this reign had drawn its recruits mostly from the small tradesman class and from the students at the universities. The former were the class most aggrieved by those charges upon which, according to the evil system of the time, many clergymen depended for a livelihood—probate duties, legacy duties, mortuary fees, and the charges in ecclesiastical courts. The latter affected Protestantism from less sordid motives, the New Learning

CHAP.
VIII.

The king no
Protestant.

Religious
persecu-
tions—a
retrospect.

CHAP.

VIII.

Hunn and
turbulent
Protestant-
ism in 1515.

movement having drifted into Lutheranism both at Oxford and Cambridge, notwithstanding the precautions of Wolsey. As early as 1515 the case of Richard Hunn, a tailor of London, had indicated the anti-Church animus of the lower and middle class. Hunn had defrauded the clergyman of his parish of a mortuary fee, and was sued in the usual way in the Bishop of London's court. He proceeded to stir up an agitation, and was foolish enough to attempt a cross action on the ground that the spiritual court was of foreign origin, and that a *præmunire* had therefore been incurred by his creditor. He not only lost his suits, but was sentenced by the bishop to imprisonment in the Lollards' Tower for the heretical and irreverent expressions which he had used in haranguing the populace. Disgusted by his disgrace and pecuniary losses, he expressed a determination to commit suicide, and was found hanging from a beam of the prison chamber. There appears to be little doubt that he died by his own hand; so embittered, however, were the London tradesmen against the clergy, that a jury of this class brought in a verdict of wilful murder against the bishop's chancellor, Dr. Horsey, and the officers in charge of Hunn. Fortunately, the matter was thoroughly sifted in Parliament, and the Attorney-General made a public acknowledgment that the accused were absolutely guiltless.¹ This did not prevent the ultra-Protestant party from perpetuating the charge, and in Foxe, of course, Hunn figures as a martyr. Numerous other illustrations of the bad feeling engendered by these clerical exactions might be adduced. The pretext was taken away when, in 1529, Parliament reformed the system of payments, con-

¹ See More's Works, p. 297.

siderably to the detriment of the clerical body. Nevertheless the clergy were still disliked and distrusted, and the lower classes frequently turned a ready ear to the preaching of the foreign Anabaptists. These sectaries had been expelled from the Continent for their violence and profanity. They had preached sedition and carnage, and had formed a scheme for burning the city of Leyden to the ground. Their religion chiefly consisted in denouncing, as devised of the devil, all those means of grace in which Christians had hitherto found comfort. It need scarcely be said that Henry was not the man to sympathize with this form of the New Learning. Motives of expediency had, however, compelled him to delay suppressing it. His attachment to Anne Boleyn was the influence which first secured concessions to the party of disorder. Further concessions were made when it became necessary to rescue the attack on the monasteries from its wide-spread unpopularity. Cromwell and other exponents of ultra-Protestant principles were now allowed to inveigh, with gross irreverence, against the established religious system. Tracts and pamphlets of the most obscene and irreligious character were circulated for the purpose of disparaging the monastic system. Blasphemous plays, in which the Eucharist was parodied, were acted in the churches. The lawlessness and unscrupulous malignity of the sectarian party were allowed free play at this time, and the only persons who suffered for their religious opinions were such of the conservative party as repudiated the king's supremacy.

On the other hand, the period preceding Cromwell's régime had illustrated the real tendency of the king's religious opinions. Wolsey had dealt leniently with the students who affected Lutheran sentiments at the

Why ultra-Protestants were tolerated from 1534 to 1539.

But perse-

CHAP.
VIII.

cutted from
1529 to
1534.

universities. The pamphlets of the new religionists were publicly burnt, but their readers were only forced to attend at the sacrifice with faggots on their shoulders, or to wear the semblance of a faggot on their dress for some specified period. But few men of that day were capable of Wolsey's moderation. The cardinal was accused of repressing proceedings against heretics, and the "Reformation Parliament" of 1529 taunted the bishops with inability to suppress religious dissension. The king's appointment of More to the office of Chancellor inaugurated a reign of persecution, and the ancient laws against heresy were working briskly from 1529 to 1534. Bilney, a gloomy and half-crazed Puritan whom Wolsey had persuaded to recant, disowned his recantation, and began preaching against the Church system in Norfolk. He was burnt in the market-place of Norwich in 1531. Bayfield, a monk of Bury, suffered in the same year for persistently circulating the prohibited literature of Protestantism. Hilton, a curate of Maidstone, had been burnt on the same charge in 1530. Tewkesbury, a leatherseller, and Bainham, a gentleman of the Middle Temple, were burned at Smithfield. The latter charged More with his death, and denounced him as acting both as accuser and judge. To More, too, must be attached the disgrace of John Fryth's execution in July, 1533. Fryth was one of the scholars whom Wolsey imported to Cardinal College from the sister university. He had got into trouble for Lutheran opinions, and deemed it advisable to retire to Germany. From this harbour of refuge he promulgated treatises in answer to More's "Supplication" and the similar productions by Bishop Fisher, and Rastall More's brother-in-law. He was unwise enough to return to England. More made

search for him, and he soon found himself in the Tower. He was decoyed into the perilous region of sacramental controversy by More's agents, and was found to hold lax opinions on the dogma of transubstantiation, and to deny that the consecrated elements might be worshipped. Cranmer and the Bishop of London laboured in vain to convert him. By the latter he was delivered to the secular arm, together with Andrew, a tailor of similar opinions, and both were burnt at Smithfield a few days after Anne Boleyn's coronation.

The suspension of hostilities was inaugurated by an Act regulating proceedings against heretics (March, 1534). In deference to the party now in the ascendant, it was enacted that the bishops should no longer be allowed to arrest suspected persons *ex officio*. Presentments were to be made in the first place before justices of the peace, and the depositions of at least two witnesses were required. The justices, if satisfied that there was ground for accusation, were to hand over the case to the ordinary, who was to try it in public court. For condemnation a royal writ *de hæretico comburendo* was required. In view of the constitutional changes now in contemplation, the Act also orders that none shall be deemed a heretic for speaking against papal laws or canons. The martyrs of the next five years were accordingly, as we observed before, the men of the opposite school, such as could not accept the "Act of Supremacy," or such as resented the king's attack on the monasteries. The winter succeeding the visit of the foreigners gave tokens of a change of policy. A turbulent Zuinglian, John Nicholson, *alias* Lambert, was condemned by Cranmer for denying the Real Presence. He appealed to the king, who willingly undertook to try the case, and summoned the whole

CHAP.
VIII.

The sop to
the Pro-
testant
faction.

Romanists
are the
only suf-
ferers from
1534 to
November,
1538.

CHAP.
VIII.

peerage to witness the proceedings. The wretched Lambert, who appears to have hoped to set the king and bishops at variance, was bullied and browbeaten by the former and confuted by the latter. At the close of the day he was sentenced to death by the king, and Cromwell had to read the sentence (Nov. 1538).

In 1539 the king was assured that the Protestant faction had served his turn sufficiently, and that his hands were free for an attack on the party of disorder. He proposed to stem the tide of undisciplined Protestantism by a bulwark of dogma, based to all appearance on decisions in the House of Lords and in Convocation. These bodies were accordingly appealed to for an opinion on certain theological questions whereon the Protestant doctors had spoken plainly. Really they were to give an authoritative sanction to Henry's foregone conclusions, which he could use hereafter as a pretext for persecution. The questions were six in number. The Convocation of Canterbury found little difficulty in giving the desired response, Latimer, Shaxton, Crome, and Taylor being the only dissentients. Cranmer appears to have confined his opposition to the House of Lords, where he spoke strongly for a time against some of the dogmas under consideration. Assurances were given him by the king which induced him to abandon this course; he henceforth attended in the House, but refrained from voting. Other prelates appear to have acted in the same way: the lay lords mostly approved of the dogmas.¹ The

The Six
Articles of
1539.

¹ See the letter from one of the temporal peers preserved in Strype's *Cranmer*, vol. ii. p. 743, and quoted by Mr. Froude: "Notwithstanding my Lord of Canterbury, my Lord of Ely, my Lord of Salisbury, my Lords of Worcester, Rochester, and S. David's defended the contrary long time, yet finally his Highness confounded them all with God's learning. . . . We of the temporality have been all of one opinion, and my Lord Chancellor and my Lord Privy Seal as go d as we can desire. My Lord of Canterbury and all the bishops have given over

opinion thus secured in Convocation and the House of Lords was embodied in a "Statute of Six Articles," which was drawn up by Henry himself, and to which he attached a bill of pains and penalties. The statute ruled as follows: (1) That in the Eucharist there remains no other substance after consecration but Christ's natural body; (2) That Communion in both kinds is not necessary *ad salutem*; (3) That priests may not marry; (4) That vows of chastity may not be disowned; (5) That the continuance of private masses is advisable, meet, and necessary; (6) That auricular confession is expedient. Such as taught, disputed, or even believed contrary to Article I. were doomed by Henry to death by burning. Disobeying or impugning any of the five other Articles entailed forfeiture of goods, and if a second offence, the death of a felon. Those who did not attend confession and mass were to be considered to have infringed the Articles. All marriages hitherto contracted by priests were declared void; the priest who should retain his wife after a certain fixed day was to suffer as a felon.

Such were the tender mercies of Henry VIII. when circumstances permitted him to view Protestantism from a theological and not a political standpoint. Heresy was for the first time made an offence which abjuration could not cancel, and the noisy disputants who had inveighed so incessantly against the mediæval view of the Eucharist were suddenly gagged by the very sovereign whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction they had always magnified. Yet it is but fair to Henry to acknowledge both that a severe statute was necessary to suppress these indecent cavillings, and that in effect the Act was used mainly as a deterrent. The Protestants their opinions, and come in to us, save Salisbury, who yet continueth a lewd fool."

CHAP.

VIII.

This Act
not often
enforced.

called it "The whip with six strings," or the "bloody Act of Six Articles." But as a fact comparatively few persons suffered its formidable penalties. A number of turbulent Protestants were indeed incarcerated, but when this severity had made sufficient sensation, they obtained a pardon by a royal proclamation. Only twenty-eight Protestants suffered the extreme penalty during the eight remaining years of the reign, and many of these victims were condemned under other statutes. All that Henry really wished was that the party of disorder should be silenced, and that the reform of the Church should be left in his own hands.

Two of the Reforming prelates, Latimer and Shaxton, the Bishops of Worcester and Salisbury, confessed their inability to accept the Six Articles, and resigned their bishoprics. They were quartered on two other bishops, and remained till the end of the reign in a sort of nominal imprisonment. Cranmer's chief ground of objection was the fact that he was himself a married man. He was assured by Cromwell that the king would not allow him to be molested. Nevertheless, he thought it wise to despatch Madam Cranmer to Calais in haste, a proceeding which seems to have caused Henry some amusement.

Fall of
Cromwell.
A.D.1540.

The triumph of the conservative party boded ill for the statesman who had made Protestantism an engine of spoliation and sacrilegious outrage. It was no uncommon thing in this period for a great minister to lose life itself when he lost his influence with the king. In Cromwell's case the fate was well earned. By all classes he appears to have been hated. The clergy and the many lay adherents of the Old Learning had had their convictions outraged by his profanity; the nobles resented the arrogance of an insolent up-

start; the lower orders knew that the author of the "visitation" scheme had in suppressing the monks deprived them of their best friends. It only remained for Cromwell to lose Henry's favour, and his ruin would be certain. The fall of the favourite was imminent in 1539. Cromwell had quite misinterpreted the theological opinions of the king, and had tried to identify him with the Protestants. Besides this impolicy, he had been unfortunate in his financial schemes. The plunder of the monasteries might well have been used to lighten the burden of taxation. But Cromwell had purchased the sympathy of spendthrift courtiers at such a price that the royal treasury was again running dry, and yet larger subsidies had to be demanded. The minister's scheme for marrying Henry to Anne of Cleves sealed his fate. Still misunderstanding the tendency of the king's religious opinions, Cromwell had devised this marriage to effect an alliance between England and the Protestant Powers of the Continent. Henry soon learnt to loathe his Dutch bride, and his anger against the promoter of the marriage appears to have been increased by some revelation of Cromwell's political negotiations. The Duke of Norfolk, the leader of the Catholic party, was allowed, if not instigated, to attain Cromwell with high treason. Bribery, peculation, heresy, assumption of exorbitant power, and menaces against the king and nobility were the definite charges mentioned in the act of attainder. Cranmer ventured a half-hearted appeal on Cromwell's behalf, but the attainder was carried with general acclamation. The fallen favourite was beheaded in July, 1540.

The death of Cromwell was succeeded by attainders against other active members of the Protestant party. In fact, the extreme men of the contending schools now

Henceforward both extremes suffer.

CHAP.
VIII.

found themselves united in a common fate. On the same day that three Lutherans—Barnes, Gerard, and Jerome—were doomed to death by burning, three deniers of the king's supremacy were sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. Four more Protestants suffered under the "Six Articles Act" in May and June, and again seven Romanists under the supremacy laws in August. Of all the Roman party none had irritated Henry so much as his cousin, Reginald Pole, who from his retreat in Italy had bitterly denounced the royal proceedings in the matters of the divorce, the separation from Rome, and the execution of More and Fisher. The Pope had rewarded Pole with promotion to the cardinalate; Henry had harmlessly revenged himself by attainting the refugee as a traitor. In May, 1540, a victim was found to expiate the offence with blood, and Pole's mother, the aged Countess of Salisbury, was sent to the block.

By such barbarities were the confines determined within which the Reformation was to make its way. The papists being prohibited from impugning the royal supremacy, and the Protestants from cavilling at the sacraments, an orderly readjustment of the Church could be continued by the king and Convocation.

But an
orderly
Reforma-
tion is con-
tinued.

The last important measures in connection with this work had been the publication of the "Institution," and the setting up of "Matthew's Bible" in the churches. The "Great Bible," or "Cranmer's Bible," had since been published, and attained a large circulation. But, as we have before noticed, the insubordinate spirit of the ultra-Protestant party made these Bible translations a bane rather than a blessing. An Act of 1543, which suppressed the profane plays and ballads wherewith the ultra-Protestants had aspersed the established re-

ligious system, checked also the reading of the Bible. For the present, none were to be allowed to read Scripture under the degree of gentleman and gentlewoman.

CHAP.
VIII.

The "Necessary Erudition of any Christian Man" was now published to take the place of the "Institution." The "Erudition" was a review of the "Institution," and was effected by a committee of divines working under the supervision of the king and Cranmer. It had been provided by Act of Parliament that the result of their labours should be "believed and accepted" by all the king's subjects. Though begun in 1540, the "Erudition" was not completed till May, 1543. The king had carefully superintended the composition of this work, and himself written a preface to it. Hence it was called the "King's Book;" the "Institution," to which the king had merely given assent, being generally known as the "Bishops' Book."

The
"King's
Book."
May, 1543.

The "Erudition" may be considered reactionary in character, inasmuch as it insists on the dogma of transubstantiation. In other respects it appears to deviate little from the lines of the "Institution." The cult of saints, concerning which the "Institution" had been altogether silent, is here made the text for a deprecation of several superstitious usages. There is a nearer approach to the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only. The king's ecclesiastical supremacy is stated in plainer language; but the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, whereon the "Institution" had said little, is also fully expounded. This feature is the more remarkable in that Cranmer's deference to royalty had by this time degenerated almost into Erastianism. The correspondence between the archbishop and the committee who produced the "Erudition" is still

CHAP.
VIII.

extant, and it is difficult to credit him with a right view of Holy Orders at this period of his career. The "Institution" had not been submitted to Convocation for approval; the "Erudition" was. Here, however, as in other cases, Henry made a show of consulting the Church's representatives, while really asking them to endorse the opinions of Cranmer and a few favourite divines.

Purgation
of devo-
tional
Offices.
A.D. 1543.

In February, 1543, the king signified his wish for a reform of missals, antiphoners, and portuses. He desired that the Pope's name should be expunged from these, and that they should be purged of "all apocryphas, feigned legends, superstitious orations, collects, versicles, and responses," as well as "names of saints which be not mentioned in the Scripture or authentical doctors." He selected two members of the Upper Houses (the Bishops of Salisbury and Ely) and three of the Lower to form a committee to execute this work. It is not known how far these divines had proceeded with their task before the death of Henry. They may be supposed, however, to have paved the way for the larger committee of the next reign, which brought out the first English Prayer-book. Meantime an English translation of the "Procession," or Litany of the Use of Sarum, was prepared by Cranmer at the suggestion of the king, with expurgations, additions, and amendments (1544). The primate's production is practically our present Litany. It differs only in containing three petitions to the Virgin and saints, and a deprecation of "the Bishop of Rome and his detestable enormities." The popularity of the translated Litany suggested to Henry the publication of an authorized English "Primer," or book of devotional Offices, and with this work Cranmer was equally successful. Primers explain-

English
Litany and
"King's
Primer."
A.D.
1544-45.

ing the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments may be traced back to Saxon times; and one such manual of devotion, including an exposition of the Seven Works of Mercy and the Seven Sacraments, had been in common use under the title "The Prymer" ever since the thirteenth century. With the dawn of Reformation had come Primers of a new type. The "Primer" of George Jaye had been one of the Protestant publications which had fallen under More's ban. Marshall's "Primer," published in 1535, was a work which obtained a wide circulation, though Convocation took measures for suppressing it. This work is of a homiletic as well as devotional character. It censures the superstitions connected with the cult of images, and the practice of basing appeals to the Almighty on the merits of saints. It speaks of the bishops of Rome as "cursed and blasphemous." A Primer of a more temperate tone had been published in 1539 by Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, at the instigation of Cromwell. It follows three main divisions, Faith, Prayer, and Works. It seems to have been too Protestant in character to please the king. The Primer now set forth in 1545 "by the king's majesty and his clergy to be taught, learned, and read, and none other to be used throughout his dominions," was really compiled and translated by Cranmer. It includes the prayers for matins, even-song, and compline, the Dirige, the new English Litany, and some excellent private prayers and graces. "If the reader," says Dean Hook, "will take the trouble of comparing this with the 'Salisbury Primer,' he will, after making all allowances for the improved state of our language during the interval, be deeply impressed with the archbishop's superiority as a writer."

CHAP.

VIII.

The "Book
of Homi-
lies."

Order and uniformity were principles dear to Henry, and he proposed to supplement the authorized Primer now published, and the authorized Prayer-book yet in the hands of the commission, with an authorized book of sermons. The ignorance and unconscious heterodoxy of many of the clergy had long suggested the propriety of such a work. Cranmer accordingly busied himself with the preparation of the "Book of Homilies" which was published shortly after Edward's accession. The twelve sermons included in this work still claim a sanction from the thirty-fifth of our Thirty-Nine Articles, which declares that both the former and the latter "Book of Homilies" "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine." It is impossible to speak with certainty as to the authorship of the several Homilies. Three of them, however, may reasonably be regarded as Cranmer's own composition, viz. those entitled "Of the Salvation of Mankind," "A Short Declaration of the True and Lively Christian Faith," "Of Good Works annexed unto Faith." That which treats "Of the Misery of Mankind" is by Bishop Bonner.

CHAPTER IX.

Edward VI.

A.D. 1547-1553.

Religious status—The boding rupture—Hatred of Cranmer—Henry's will—Ultra-Reformers in the ascendant—The Protector plunders the Church—Cranmer's indifference—Not attributable to Protestant convictions—But to moral infirmity—The Reformation in ill odour—Cranmer's licences and letters patent—Was Cranmer an Erastian?—Appropriation of chantries—Violence of the Reformers—The visitation of dioceses—Desecration of ornaments—Enforcement of the "First Book of Homilies"—Gardiner's brave resistance—He is imprisoned and deprived—Poynt, his successor—Bishop Bonner—Influx of foreign Protestants—Their unsympathetic attitude—The Eucharistic controversy—Communion in both kinds—The Latin-English missal—The "First Prayer-book of Edward VI."—The English ordinal—Clerical celibacy—Survival of prejudices—Fasting not meritorious—Disputes on the Sacramental Presence—Unfairness of the Reforming champions—The Old Learning proscribed—Maladministration of sees, livings, and university revenues—Political mismanagement—Revolt against the new religion—Lamentations of Latimer—Maladministrations continued by Northumberland—"Injunctions" against the ancient ritual—Bonner made an example of—Ridley's arbitrary innovations—Sanctioned by the Council—More bishops in prison—Attempt to coerce the Princess Mary—Suppression of heretics—Joan Bocher—Appointment of Hooper to Gloucester—His Puritan scruples—He is imprisoned by Cranmer till he conforms—The Forty-two Articles—Compared with our "Thirty-nine Articles"—The Reforming Catechism—The Second Prayer-book—Cranmer's opinions modified—Unfortunate changes in Communion Office—Fate of the Second Prayer-book—The revisions of the Prayer-book compared—Foreign divines still dissatisfied—The "Reformatio Legum"—Commissions of search for Church property.

THE cause of Reformation had gained substantial concessions from the reign of Henry VIII., and the changes had been accepted cheerfully by most Englishmen. Subjection to Rome had been generally rejected as a non-essential; the abuses connected with

Religious
status.

CHAP.
IX.

the cult of images and commemoration of saints had been removed; an English Bible was being circulated under wise limitations; the Canons and Service Books were being expurgated; indecent cavilling had been forcibly silenced. With the exception of the suppression of the monasteries, sober-minded persons of neither school had much to complain of.

The boding
rupture.

Nevertheless, from the time of Cromwell's fall a rupture between the conservative and Reforming sections had been impending,—had, in fact, only been stayed by the firmness of Henry himself. To the former, especially to its leaders, Gardiner and Norfolk, Archbishop Cranmer was particularly odious, and more than one plot had been hatched to undermine his influence with the king. London and Thornton, both discreditably connected with the visitation of the monasteries, were employed in 1543 to get up a case against the archbishop as a patron of heretics. Sir John Gostwick had accused him in the Commons as holding an unorthodox view of the Eucharist. In both cases the king had protected his favourite. The adverse faction in the Privy Council had menaced him with more serious danger in 1545. Representation was made to the king that “the archbishop with his learned men had so infected the whole realm with their unsavoury doctrine, that these parts of the land were become abominable heretics.” It was prayed “that the archbishop might be committed to the Tower until he might be examined.” The king, on this occasion, saw Cranmer in private, and assured him of protection. When the cause was brought before him, he informed the Council that the archbishop was his trusted friend, and forthwith enforced a reconciliation. The flame of discord was thus kept under, but not extinguished.

Hatred of
Cranmer.

This feud at court was a fair indication of the relations of the two great parties throughout England.

CHAP.
IX.

In 1536 Parliament had given the king power to bequeath the crown as he pleased. By Henry's will his son Edward, a precocious boy of ten, was named as his immediate successor; Mary, the daughter of Catharine of Aragon, came next in succession; then Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn. The descendants of his younger sister Mary were placed next; then those of his elder sister Margaret. In the Council of sixteen, nominated by Henry to govern during Edward's minority, both the religious parties were represented. The Reforming section, however, soon obtained a predominance which enabled it to defy its rival, and establish a policy of spoliation and precipitate change. Hertford, an ultra-Protestant, was elected Lord Protector. He procured a patent for this office, by which he was enabled to rule with or without the Council, as he pleased. Two of the leading anti-Reformers, Tonstal of Durham and Wriothesley the chancellor, were soon altogether ousted from the Council; the others were summoned as the Protector thought convenient. Gardiner, the leading prelate of the conservative party, had not been included among Henry's nominees. Archbishop Cranmer, however, was a member of the Council, and those who desired orderly and judicious reform may have hoped to find in the primate a counterpoise to such unprincipled iconoclasts as the Protector. If so, they hoped in vain. Hertford, better known by his later title of Duke of Somerset, was professedly a Protestant of the Calvinist type. The sincerity of his Protestantism has been questioned; its utility to himself during his Protectorate is open to no doubt. His first proceeding was to appropriate five

Henry's
will.

Ultra-
Reformers
in the
ascendant.

The
Protector
plunders
the Church.

CHAP.
IX.

religious houses, in addition to the three which Henry had conferred on him. To provide materials for Somerset House, he destroyed the Church of S. Mary-le-Strand, and that of the Knights of S. John; and to form apartments for his suite, he pulled down the houses and chapels of three bishops. Westminster Abbey, recently made a cathedral church, was also threatened with demolition. Dean Benson saved it by alienating to the Protector and to his brother a number of its manorial endowments. Somerset gave further evidence of his ultra-Protestant zeal by a gratuitous destruction of the charnel house and monuments in S. Paul's Churchyard.¹

Cranmer's
indiffer-
ence.

And Cranmer, the primate of all England, "cared for none of these things." The profanity and peculation of the Government roused honest Latimer to pulpit invectives, and Latimer's note was taken up by Knox, the northern Calvinist. But the chief pastor of the English Church regarded her wrongs with indifference. Discreetly silent when Henry sacked the monasteries, he now extended his tolerance to the hypocrisy of Somerset, and to the more pronounced Vandalism of Northumberland. It has been urged on his behalf that Cranmer had conceived a secret liking for ultra-Protestantism before the death of Henry. The assertion is, however, utterly void of foundation. The primate was sufficiently tainted with the old leaven to sing masses of requiem for Henry and for Francis I. At the coronation of the boy-king he celebrated the Mass of the Holy Ghost with the usual ritual. It is possible that Cranmer was at this time inclined to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, but not a step lower had he thought of going. During the next five years he embraced that

Not attri-

¹ See Stow, *Survey of London*, p. 122 (ed. 1876).

view of a real but undefinable Presence which is enunciated in the "Defence of the true and Catholic doctrine" of 1550, and in the Articles of 1553. This view he probably learnt from his former chaplain, Ridley, who himself discovered it in the works of John Scotus Erigena, the controversialist of the ninth century. Ridley, indeed, did not stop here, but became something very like a "sacramentary," or denier of sacramental grace, before the end of this reign. But he did not go in Cranmer's company. The primate was, doubtless, sincere in his subsequent resistance to the Puritan innovations of Hooper; and it is impossible to suppose that with iconoclasts such as Somerset he at any time had a religious sympathy.

CHAP.
IX.

butable
to Protes-
tant con-
victions.

It appears that Cranmer was incapacitated by natural indecision of character for executing the duties of a primate under such régimes as the present. In private life he was amiable and estimable: as a man of learning he ranked high, if not among the highest. But as primate of all England, Cranmer was simply contemptible. He had been promoted, like numerous prelates before and since, to serve a sovereign's whim. It was his misfortune to survive the occasion, and be primate when the Church required something better than a royal puppet at her helm. The fire of religious animosity had now broken out; its flames could not but cast a glare on the incapacity of the primate. Cranmer collapsed, and the Church was manipulated as Somerset and Northumberland thought fit. A comparison of the years 1547 and 1553 will illustrate the effect on the English Reformation. When Henry died, the Reformation was undoubtedly accepted as far as it went by a vast majority of subjects, including such

But to
moral
infirmity.

The Refor-
mation in
ill odour.

CHAP.

IX.

names as Bishop Gardiner and Mary Tudor. When Edward died, the Reforming cause stank in the nostrils of almost every honest citizen, the accession of Mary was greeted with an unparalleled ebullition of enthusiasm, and the suppression of Protestant anarchy was deemed to be cheaply purchased by a disgraceful surrender to the Pope. Fortunate it is for our Church that Mary's cup of cruelty was found even more unpalatable than that mixture of hypocrisy, profanity, and greed wherewith the Edwardian "vessels of grace" brimmed over.

His biographer shows that throughout the flux of his religious tenets two leading ideas had a permanent charm for Cranmer.¹ One was the Bible as a corrective to the Church; the other, the royal supremacy as a defiance to the Pope. His fidelity to the latter conception was now illustrated by an extraordinary deference to the boy-king and his representatives. Henry had insisted on giving the bishops licences. Cranmer thought it necessary to apply to Edward VI. for a renewal of his licence,² and he compelled the other prelates to do the same. Worse still, he contrived the passing of an Act whereby all bishops should be appointed by letters patent from the Crown, without the *congé d'élire*³ which had hitherto and has since been

Cranmer's
licences
and letters
patent.

¹ Hook, Archbishops, "Thomas Cranmer," p. 136.

² Burnet, Records, Part II. p. 6.

³ On the *congé d'élire*, which at present exists as a mere form, Dean Hook writes: "It is wise, however, to cling to a form which may hereafter be inspired with life. The ceremonial opening of Convocation was for many years a mere form, but by attending to the form the Convocation was prepared to act, when that liberty of action permitted to all other institutions could no longer be held from the Church of England. The time may come—much to be deplored—when, in a revolutionary age, it may be the duty of the English Church in a popular movement to take a decided part against the Crown, and nothing is to be despised which gives to any institution the power of free action."—Archbishops, "Thomas Cranmer," p. 237.

ceded to the dean and chapter. This proceeding excites our indignation as an encroachment on the liberty of the subject. It is yet more reprehensible in that it led contemporaries and posterity to believe that the archbishop held those low views with regard to his sacred office which were entertained by Somerset and the Gospel "professors." Dean Hook has, we think, cleared Cranmer¹ of real participation in such views, pointing out that in the "Bishops' Book" of 1537, in the "King's Book" of 1543, and in the Catechism of 1548, the archbishop plainly traces Holy Orders to an Apostolic source. And he is, perhaps, right in describing Cranmer as an "ultra-Tory" rather than an Erastian, maintaining that the nomination to bishoprics was vested absolutely in the Crown, just as he maintained that the king held his Crown of hereditary right, and not (as all other primates had believed) by consent of Church and State. Cranmer may have known that such royal prerogative no more makes the Crown the source of episcopal functions, than the prerogative of a lay patron makes him competent to confer Holy Orders. But the Protestant statesmen thought otherwise, and we do not find that Cranmer tried to enlighten them.

Was
Cranmer
an Eras-
tian?

Having done their best to secularize the Church's officers, the party in power made another clutch at the Church's revenues. A bill was brought in to confer on Edward those endowments of chantries, hospitals, and guilds which an Act of Parliament had granted to his father. Edward would, of course, be represented

Appropriation of
chantries.
A.D. 1547.

¹ This, however, may well be doubted in view of the correspondence between the archbishop and the committee of divines appointed to compose the *Erudition*. Cranmer actually commits himself to such statements as these: "A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also." "He that is appointed to be bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointment thereto is sufficient."—See Cranmer, *Remains* (Parker Society), p. 117.

CHAP.
IX.

by the Council. The chantries were chapels endowed for the offering of prayers and masses on the founder's behalf. It was now plausibly argued against these foundations that "a great part of superstition and error in Christian religion" was due to the retention of masses for the dead. Cranmer on this occasion endeavoured to resist the Protector. The uselessness of masses for the dead he could not yet have realized, and he perhaps dreaded lest this insidious bill should be a means of despoiling the universities. Adopting for the nonce the line of the conservative divines, he moved that the measure might well be postponed till the king should be of age. His proposal won the support of the Commons. But a hungry clique in the House of Lords vehemently abetted the Protector's scheme, and the bill was carried. The lands and other endowments of the chantries were nominally made over to the king. They were really sold for little or nothing to Somerset's partisans.

Violence
of the
Reformers,

When times are ripe for change, it requires no ordinary wisdom and firmness to enforce the distinction between reform and revolution. Henry had found it necessary to curb the violence of the Protestant sectaries with the "Act of Six Articles." This and the Acts of Henry IV. and Henry V. against Lollards were, of course, repealed by the Protector. The party of disorder had full liberty of action, and it seemed likely that Henry's progressive reformation would give place to a destructive outbreak. Two extreme men, Barlow Bishop of S. David's, and Ridley, principal of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, were encouraged to denounce the old ceremonial in sermons at S. Paul's Cross. Their note was taken up by a host of sycophant preachers. In vain Gardiner pleaded with the Protector that the use of images and

holy water might be continued without danger of superstition, if the people were properly instructed; that it would be found easier to raise than to direct this flood of popular captiousness; above all, that religious innovations were inappropriate while a child was on the throne.¹ The ultra-Protestants had it all their own way. A visitation of dioceses was ordered by the Protector, which threatened to deal with the churches much as Cromwell had dealt with the monasteries. Every picture, every image was to be treated "so that there should be no memory of the same." Stained glass was destroyed; frescoes were whitewashed; bells and altar plate, where not concealed by faithful Churchmen, were seized and consigned to the melting-pot.

CHAP.
IX.

The visita-
tion of
dioceses.
Aug. 1547.

Desecra-
tion of
ornaments.

For the execution of these outrages the kingdom was divided into six circuits; to each circuit was apportioned a committee composed of two gentlemen, a civilian, a divine, and a registrar, and accompanied by a *cortège* of Protestant preachers. Following the precedent of Cromwell's visitation, the Protector suspended the powers of the bishops while the visitation lasted. "Injunctions" with regard to the future performance of clerical duties were to be circulated by the visitors. The purport of these was that incumbents were to use the Litany in the English tongue; to preach about the royal supremacy at least four times a year; to set up copies of the Bible and of Erasmus's Paraphrase of the Gospels; and to take heed that all shrines, pictures, and paintings were destroyed. The "Book of Homilies" was also forced upon their acceptance by these "Injunctions." We have already mentioned the publication of this work by Archbishop Cranmer. Such curates as were unable to produce original sermons

Enforce-
ment of the
"First
Book of
Homilies."

¹ See the Letters in Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 24 and seq.

CHAP.
IX.

were now charged to preach one of the Homilies every Sunday.

It need scarcely be observed that this invasion of clerical rights was as impolitic as it was discreditable to its authors. The experiment of conducting visitations by means of an inquisitorial commission had been tried and universally reprobated when the monasteries were despoiled. The enforcement of a new religious manual on the sole authority of the primate was unprecedented. It was a silly feat of absolutism—the more silly in that the sanction of Convocation would doubtless have been easily obtained for the “Book of Homilies.” We may add that it was a feat characteristic of such a mind as Crammer’s. Like most weak rulers, the primate could atone for vacillation and neglect of duty by occasional instalments of tyranny in quarters where tyranny could not be resented.

Gardiner’s
brave
resistance.

The liberties of the Church were now bravely maintained by Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. He did not admire the Homilies or the Paraphrase, and believed that the former publication contradicted the authoritative Erudition of 1543. Nor did he see on what ground he, as a bishop, was expected to enforce the “Injunctions.” They had no authority,¹ and they were not needed. In short, he saw his “late sovereign slandered, religion assaulted, the realm troubled, and

¹ No tenable theory of the relations of Church and State admits of such acts of usurpation as were perpetrated in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. The sovereign has no more right to encroach on the functions of synods or ecclesiastical officers by virtue of a royal supremacy over the national Church, than he has to supersede the secular judges and administer justice in person, on the plea that he is “over all causes within his dominion supreme.” Nor would the acquiescence of courtier prelates of the Crammer type make such transfer of jurisdiction a whit more constitutional. Gardiner, in arguing that royal “Injunctions” cannot supersede constitutional rights, instances the fate of Wolsey, who had (according to the judges) incurred a *præmunire* for serving Henry too well. See the Letter in Foxe, vol. vi. p. 43.

peaceable men disquieted." He could but cry—Let things remain as Henry VIII. had left them. The prelate's influence was great; it was therefore determined to purchase his connivance with an offer of a seat in the Privy Council. But Gardiner was not of the venal order of statesmen so common at this time. He remained true to his convictions, and refused both "Injunctions" and Homilies. He was thereupon committed to the Fleet. Shortly afterwards, he was required to preach before the king on the authority of the Council, the abolition of chantries, the use of common prayer in the vernacular, and other innovations. His sermon, says an unfriendly historian, "was such as a moderate High Church English divine might preach at the present day, with applause even from Evangelicals."¹ It was nevertheless deemed unsatisfactory; he was committed to the Tower, and the Government licence empowering him to act as Bishop of Winchester was withdrawn. Later on, the Council disgraced itself by giving the bishopric to Poyntet, a professed ultra-Protestant, who consented to pay an enormous percentage of the episcopal revenues. Poyntet was a man of some ability, and the Catechism which was published with the forty-two Articles of 1553 was his composition. But his moral character was notoriously bad. It appears that in July, 1551, he was convicted of living in open adultery with a butcher's wife, and compelled to pay the outraged husband a yearly fine.

CHAP.
IX.

He is imprisoned
and
deprived.

Poyntet, his
successor.

A less determined resistance was offered by Bonner, Bishop of London, a prelate of staunch Catholic principles, but in character altogether inferior to Gardiner. Bonner professed to receive the "Injunctions" and

Bishop
Bonner.

¹ Froude, History of England, vol. vi. p. 347.

CHAP.

IX.

Homilies under protest. This was not considered sufficient, and an incarceration in the Fleet soon induced him to withdraw his protest. He was accordingly restored for a time to liberty.

Influx of
foreign
Pro-
testants.

Foreign Protestantism had in vain attempted to meddle with the English Reformation under Henry. The present reign was more propitious to such influences. Continental refugees swarmed into England, and for a time obtained influence among the clergy and in the universities. Cranmer, "ever learning," accorded them a patronage which was too often requited with an offensive assumption of spiritual superiority. The Lutherans appear to have had most influence with the primate; the Calvinists were the most insolent and dictatorial. Vermigli, commonly called Peter Martyr, who had struck out a line between those of Luther and Zuingli, was placed in the divinity chair at Oxford, in 1548. Bucer, an excellent divine of similar sentiments, held the same position at Cambridge, and with him came Paul Fagius, an erudite Hebraist. Bernard Ochin, a less creditable sample of foreign Protestantism, who defended polygamy and eventually became a Socinian, was made a prebend of Canterbury. John à Lasco, a learned Polish nobleman, was appointed superintendent of the foreign congregations in London, and is supposed to have had much weight with Cranmer. It must, however, be admitted that none of the religious formularies of this reign gave satisfaction to the foreigners. They were the first to abuse every publication¹ of the Reforming prelates, and

Their un-
sympa-
thetic
attitude.

¹ The usual *tone* of the foreign teachers is illustrated by a letter written by John ab Ulmis to Bullinger on the subject of Cranmer's Catechism: "I would have you know this for certain, that this Thomas has fallen into so heavy a slumber that we entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter. For he has lately published a Catechism, in which he

showed themselves utterly unable to distinguish between reformation such as Henry had inaugurated and schism such as had found favour on the Continent. Had matters been left entirely in their hands, the Church would doubtless have become a Protestant sect. When Edward died, these clamorous divines hastily fled, resigning the crown of martyrdom to the prelates whose faint-heartedness they had so often impugned.

We have noticed the publication of an English Litany in 1545, and the appointment of a commission to revise the missal and breviary. It is not clear how far this commission had proceeded before the death of Henry. On the accession of Edward two crucial questions affecting the character of the future missal became the subject of much public discussion. The divines of the Old Learning maintained the dogma of transubstantiation, and discerned in the Holy Eucharist a sacrificial efficacy, which might benefit the souls of the departed. Cranmer's continental friends, on the other hand, though differing among themselves as to the meaning, value, and efficacy of the Sacrament, were unanimous in disavowing transubstantiation, and in treating the sacred rite as a communion rather than a sacrifice. Many English divines held these views, and Cranmer was fast inclining to them. On December 2, 1547, Convocation had unanimously resolved that the Sacrament ought to be received in both kinds. Government, perhaps mindful of the effect of such religious changes on the much-coveted chantries, had promptly passed an Act to the same effect (Dec. 20).

The
Eucharist
contro-
versy.

Com-
munion in
both kinds.

has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the Papists in the Holy Supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well grounded." In a similar strain John Burcher writes to Bullinger with reference to the same subject.

CHAP.

IX.

The Latin-
English
missal.

In March, 1548, without further appeal to Convocation, a Latin-English missal was published in the king's name which provided for the change of practice. This missal was compiled by the thirteen divines¹ who were engaged in revising the ancient Offices, and who at the close of this year brought out the new Book of Common Prayer, commonly called the Prayer-book of 1549. In this missal we find a less marked deviation from the mediæval usage than in the work which superseded it. The service is in Latin until the priest has himself partaken of the elements, and the holy rite is termed a sacrifice² for living and dead. The English portion begins with an exhortation not very different from our "Dearly beloved in the Lord." Then come the address, "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent," the Confession, and the Absolution, the last differing slightly from the form now in use. Then the "comfortable words," the prayer of humble access, and the formulæ of administration. The clauses, "Take and eat this, etc.," "Drink this, etc.," as yet form no part of these formulæ. The Office then closes with the blessing. The greater part of this Office was, of course, taken from the ancient missals; what new matter was added was borrowed from the "Consultation" of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne.

¹ Cranmer, Day, Goodryke, Skyp, Holbeach, Ridley, and Thirleby, all of the episcopate; Deans May, Taylor, and Haynes; and Doctors Robertson, Redman, and Cox. Day, Thirleby, and Skyp formed a conservative minority which protested against the changes embodied in the Prayer-book which their brethren brought out at the end of this year.

² It is plain that a prominence is given to the sacrificial character of the function which is missing in the Prayer-book of 1549. In the latter, as in our present Prayer-book, the sacrificial character is not excluded, but made subordinate. It is mentioned only in the prayer which now follows the act of reception. In the Missal of 1548, on the other hand, the priest is directed to "offer the sacrifice unto the Lord," with the prayer (in Latin), "Receive . . . this oblation which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in Thine honour, and in that of Blessed Mary and of all Thy saints, for mine own sins and offences, and for the health and salvation of the living, and for the rest of all the faithful departed."

This Latin-English missal was probably intended to pave the way for the English Prayer-book. Its publication excited much controversy, and the nature of the Eucharist became such a burning question that the Government thought fit in the autumn of this year to inhibit all preaching. Meantime the thirteen divines were preparing the collection of English Offices which formed the "First Prayer-book of Edward VI." They finished their work in November. The book is described by the Council as "agreed to by the whole clergy," and as having received the consent of "the bishops and all other the learned men in this our realm in their synods and convocations provincial." In this matter, then, we may infer that deference to the constitutional privileges of Convocation was deemed advisable. The Prayer-book received the sanction of the king in Council, and was laid before Parliament in December.

The "First
Prayer-
book of
Edward
VI."
A.D. 1549.

It encountered much opposition, especially from eight bishops in the Upper House. At last an Act enforcing its exclusive reception on and after Whitsunday following was carried, and the provisions of this Act were forestalled by the London clergy, who adopted the new Office as early as Easter. This "Act of Uniformity" says nothing about any change in doctrine, but only dwells on the inconvenience caused by the divergencies in the Uses of Sarum, York, Bangor, Lincoln, etc., and on the advantages of uniformity. Penalties for depraving or ridiculing the Prayer-book were provided by this Act, and a subsequent Order in Council prescribed the destruction of such "books called antiphones, manuals, missals, grails, processionalis," etc., as should be judged obstructive to the new Office. We shall hereafter mention in detail the respects in which the first Prayer-

CHAP.

IX.

The English
ordinal.
Feb. 1550.

book differed from our present Book of Common Prayer. One obvious deficiency in the new formulary—the absence of an ordinal—was soon met by the appointment of a committee consisting of “six prelates and six other men learned in God’s law.” By one of those pieces of proleptic legislation so common in this period, the ordinal drawn up by these commissioners had legal authority before it was completed. It was published, with the assent of eleven of the twelve commissioners, on February 28, 1550.

The Prayer-book of 1549 appears to have satisfied neither party. The foreign divines especially resented its conservative spirit, and Cranmer was reproached with indifference to the tenets of Protestantism. In deference to the opinion of these persons the work was recast, and there appeared in April, 1552, that Second Prayer-book of Edward VI. in which the Communion Service is so mutilated that it might well be mistaken for a mere memorial rite. Fortunately, the death of Edward occurred before the date which was to give this work legal authority. Though circulated in certain dioceses, it never had even State sanction, much less the approval of Convocation. The Prayer-book of Elizabeth, though sanctioning many of the concessions made to the Reforming party in 1552, restored the central act of Christian worship to its true dignity.

Clerical
celibacy.

In the opinion of most members of our communion the compulsory celibacy of the clergy is one of the most pernicious accessories of the mediæval system. It is surprising, therefore, to find that it was with the greatest reluctance that Edward’s Parliament ceded to the priesthood the right of marrying. Convocation had decided that the clergy should be free in this

matter. A bill permitting the ordination of married men was discussed in December, 1547, but could not obtain the sanction of the Lords. The subject was again brought before the Houses in 1548, and a repeal of all positive laws enforcing celibacy was grudgingly conceded. The Act was saddled with this testimony to the state of popular sentiment: "It were better for the estimation of priests, and therefore much to be wished, that they would willingly endeavour themselves to a perpetual chastity." The popular prejudice on this subject is the more remarkable since the clergy of England had never been pledged to celibacy by a special vow. They only transgressed a canon of the Church by entering the state of matrimony. Such transgression was winked at—was, in fact, rather the rule than the exception. By ascetics it was inveighed against in no measured terms—terms which modern Protestants have sometimes interpreted as proving the gross licentiousness of mediæval times. But, as a rule, neither priests nor laymen saw much harm in the prevalent neglect of this canon. Archbishop Warham was a married man; so probably was Wolsey; so certainly was Cranmer. It might certainly have been supposed that these and countless other conspicuous cases had prepared the country for the abrogation of the nominal restrictions. By both parties, however, this concession to the clergy was disliked. The so-called Reformers were, as we have before observed, to a large extent men who merely hated the clergy; to this section anything calculated to extend clerical liberties was necessarily displeasing. The conservative minority had, of course, now learnt to regard all religious changes with suspicion. So unacceptable was the measure that in 1552 another statute had to be

Survival of
prejudices.

CHAP.

IX.

passed, declaring that children of married clergymen must be regarded as legitimate.

Fastine
not meri-
torious.

The Parliaments of this reign readily undertook the discussion of all such subjects as are the province of clerical assemblies. In the session of 1548 the duty of fasting received consideration. A liberal view with regard to superstitious restrictions is easily attained when we ourselves are the parties restricted. The Houses clung, as we have seen, to clerical celibacy, but they readily acknowledged that there was nothing pleasing to God in observance of fasts. But by an amusing amalgamation of things sacred and secular, they ruled that the days of abstinence, Fridays and Saturdays in Lent, the Ember days, etc., should still be strictly kept, since their observance impelled men to eat fish, and "by eating of fish much flesh is saved to the country."

Disputes on
the Sacra-
mental
Presence.

The years 1549 and 1550 did much to embitter the animosity of religious parties. The foreign Protestants, disgusted at the conservative character of the Prayer-book, vented their wrath in clamorous denunciations of the Old Learning. They challenged their adversaries to public disputations at the two universities. The subject of the Real Presence was the usual theme of disputation, and the doctrine of transubstantiation was, of course, specially assailed by the champions of foreign Protestantism. Their conduct in these controversies can hardly be considered creditable. They refused to treat the scholastic term "transubstantiation" in its scholastic sense, but persistently argued as if it implied "transaccidentation"—an easy butt for their ridicule. Sometimes they would decline to argue unless their adversaries confined themselves to terms used in the New Testament, though it was a palpable *petitio principii* to

assume that the New Testament writers had spoken exhaustively on the nature of the Holy Eucharist. In this way a cheap triumph was secured by Peter Martyr, who ousted Dr. Smith from the divinity chair at Oxford. The same unfairness marks Cranmer's strategy in his pamphlet controversy with Gardiner. Again and again the champion of the Old Learning explains what is transubstantiation and what it is not; as repeatedly Cranmer inveighs against transaccidentation as if it were maintained by Gardiner.¹ Cranmer was probably little versed in scholastic theology, but it can hardly be maintained that he did not know the meaning of a dogma for the denial of which he had recently sent men to the stake. Transubstantiation doubtless was, and is, confounded with transaccidentation by illiterate Romanists as well as illiterate Protestants. It is, in fact, one of the many objectionable features in this dogma that it enforces the general acceptance of an idea which none but the educated can apprehend. Misapprehension, however, can hardly be pleaded on behalf of controversialists who had studied theology, and studied it as Romanists.

CHAP.
IX.

Unfairness
of the
Reforming
champions.

It need scarcely be said that in such controversies the New Learning always came off triumphant. Bonner's celebrated apophthegm at the Marian disputation, "You have the word, but we have the sword," was practically forestalled by the behaviour of the Reformers to the

The Old
Learning
proscribed

¹ Here is a specimen of Cranmer's controversial style. Gardiner has been pleading that the terms "sensibly," "really," "substantially," "corporally," were used by Transubstantiationists, and even Lutherans, in the scholastic sense, and must be so interpreted by his adversary. Cranmer replies, "When you come here to your *lies*, declaring the words 'sensibly,' 'really,' 'substantially,' . . . you speak so fondly unlearnedly and ignorantly as they that knew you not right think you understood neither grammar, English, nor reason. . . . All Englishmen understand by these words . . . the manner and form of being, and not the thing itself without the said forms and manners. . . . But this one thing I wonder at, that you, being so much used to lie, do not yet know what 'ly' meaneth."—Cranmer on the Lord's Supper (Parker Society), 157, 158.

CHAP.

IX.

Maladministration
of sees,
livings, and
university
revenues.

Transubstantiationists. Penalties were attached to a retention of the old missal after Whitsuntide, 1549. Gardiner had been already imprisoned; Bonner and other bishops of the Old Learning were soon to share his fate. When religious sympathies and indignation at the Council's mismanagement impelled the Oxfordshire peasantry to insurrection, the parish priests were promptly hanged by Lord Gray from their own church towers. "Godly jealousy for the Gospel" not unfrequently gave its peculiar interpretation to the Pauline adage that "godliness is great gain." Such relics of superstition as church bells and Communion vessels of silver had already found their way to the Government melting-pots. A greedy eye was now cast on the episcopal revenues. Most sees were in this reign robbed of their best manors. The occupants counted themselves fortunate if the alienation took the insidious form of an exchange. In some dioceses the bishopric was kept vacant and administered by a Government agent. The squire who had Church patronage dutifully followed the lead. He "protested" against Catholicism by instituting to his vacant benefice his steward, or huntsman, or gamekeeper, and quietly pocketing the revenues. Avarice and bigotry, even when the accessories of a New Learning, are as inimical to the cause of education as to that of religion. The universities accordingly suffered as severely as the Church. The professors of a stereotyped Gospel could afford to scorn learned pursuits and vote degrees anti-Christian. Government showed its sympathy for this ultra-Protestant contingent by suppressing exhibitions and professorships both at Oxford and Cambridge. Both universities were forsaken by the studious, and given over to irreverent undergraduate orgies.

"Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets; college libraries plundered and burnt. The divinity schools were planted with cabbages, and the Oxford laundresses dried clothes in the School of Arts. Anarchy was avenging superstition, again in turn to be more frightfully avenged."¹

The conduct of domestic and foreign policy in this reign was as unsatisfactory as that of religious reform. The present was an era of great social change. The decay of the feudal system—the transfer of land to the commercial class—the increasing wool trade, with the consequent conversion of arable into pasture land and diminution of agricultural labour—the introduction of foreign luxuries and diversion of money hitherto spent at home;—these were problems with which the present Government was quite unable to cope. Abroad unsuccessful wars were being waged with Scotland and France. At home the administration was an outrage alike to principles of economy and to the dictates of justice. Money was borrowed from foreign usurers at enormous percentage; the coinage was debased again and again; the landed gentry were allowed to enclose the commons hitherto accessible to the poor; and when religious houses were suppressed no provision was made for the continuance of alms. The dissatisfaction of the lower orders asserted itself in the form of insurrection. The movement in Devonshire and Cornwall cost the lives of five thousand men; almost as many perished in Norfolk. Strategy, like theology, looked abroad for assistance, and while German divines argued down the champions of Catholicism, German Lanzknechts shot down the rebels. It is not surprising that the peasantry ascribed their sufferings to the introduction of the

Political
misman-
agement.Revolt
against
the new
religion.

¹ Froude, vol. v. p. 270.

CHAP.
IX.Lamenta-
tions of
Latimer.

New Learning and clamoured for the restoration of the missal. Nor was the Reforming party without adherents who could discern that a Puritan faith did not necessarily involve purity of practice, and who could depict in their true colours the proceedings of the Government. Latimer, who did not return to his bishopric on Edward's accession, but devoted himself to preaching, boldly attacked the landlord class as "rent raisers," "step lords," "who do intend plainly to make the yeomanry slavery." While the foreign preachers likened the depredators to Moses or Joshua, or dubbed them "valiant soldiers in Christ," this true Reformer saw little cause for Protestant self-congratulation in the present state of affairs. "In times past," he says, "men were full of pity and compassion . . . now charity is waxen old, none helpeth the scholar, nor yet the poor; now that the knowledge of God's word is brought to light, and many earnestly study and labour to set it forth, almost no man helpeth to maintain them."¹ To the same effect spoke Bernard Gilpin. Cranmer did not denounce the prevalent antinomianism, but his confidence in the foreign preachers appears to have been shaken.

Maladmin-
istration
continued
by North-
umberland.

Somerset's mismanagement resulted in his disgrace in the autumn of 1549. His life was for the present spared, but he was deprived of the Protectorate, and henceforth the leading spirit in the Council was Warwick, created in 1551 Duke of Northumberland. The Old Learning party, at first inclined to regard this change with satisfaction, found that it brought them little benefit. By Bale, the chaplain of Bishop Poynt, Northumberland is described as the "second Moses" of the reign. Even Hooper could represent him as "a most holy and fearless instrument of the end of God,"

¹ See Latimer's Sermons (Parker Society), Sermons vi. and vii.

because also "the terror and thunderbolt of the Roman bishops." Really he inherited the avarice and incapacity, without the religious convictions, of the minister whom he succeeded. Protestantism of a Calvinistic type continued in the ascendant, and it became plain that concessions would be made to this school of religion in the formularies of the future. Already the Government, provoked by the anti-Protestant cries of the insurgents, had assumed a more uncompromising attitude with reference to the Old Learning. The autumn of 1549 had produced a new batch of "Injunctions," which rendered it impossible for the conservative clergy to qualify their adoption of the new Prayer-book by a retention of the ancient ritual. These "Injunctions" prohibited many practices¹ hitherto used at the celebration of mass, and allowed not more than one celebration in a day.

CHAP.
IX.

"Injunctions"
against the
ancient
ritual.
A.D. 1549.

Foremost among those clergy who had obeyed the letter of the law while detesting its spirit had been Bonner, Bishop of London. The treatment of this malcontent was as unjust as that of Gardiner, and it is unpleasant to record that Hooper was foremost among his persecutors. Bonner was ordered, in the July of this year, to preach a sermon at Paul's Cross on behalf of the Government and their Erastian policy. He was to state that the rebels "were incurring damnation, ever to be in the burning fire of hell with Lucifer;" that the magistrate might change the rites, forms, and

Bonner
made an
example of

¹ Among the particular practices forbidden are kissing the altar, breathing upon the bread or chalice, ringing of sacring bells, and "setting any light upon the Lord's Table at any time." With reference to the last-named practice, it is noticeable that the first set of "Injunctions" had ordered "two lights on the altar afore the Sacrament, for signification that Christ is the true light of the world." A notorious verdict of recent date has, however, prohibited this most suggestive ancient emblem, in defiance of the rubric, which orders the retention of the ornaments commonly used in 1548.

CHAP.
IX.

Ridley's
arbitrary
innova-
tions.
June, 1550.

Sanctioned
by the
Council.
Nov. 1550.

ceremonies of religion at his pleasure; that the Government had this power during Edward's nonage; and that the devotion of a person retaining the Latin service was rendered valueless by his sin in disobeying the magistrate. Bonner was coarse, vulgar, and cruel, but hypocrisy was no part of his character. In preaching he omitted some of the topics prescribed; on others he discoursed in an unsatisfactory manner. Hooper was employed to indict him; he was committed to the Marshalsea, and in October was deprived of his bishopric. The conduct of the great Reforming bishop who was appointed to succeed him was as indefensible as that of Hooper. Acting on his own responsibility, Ridley had begun to substitute tables for altars in his diocese of Rochester. When translated to London, he pulled down the altar at S. Paul's, and ordered that throughout his diocese the "Lord's board" should be set up, "after the form of an honest table," in such place as should be considered convenient. Ridley probably thought that the impending revision of the Prayer-book would justify this transformation, which really might imply that the Sacrament was only a commemorative meal. But that an individual bishop should make this change while the "Act of Uniformity" still sanctioned a Eucharistic service of a Catholic character, was strange indeed. The inconsistency, however, was indiscernible to the Council, who in November legalized Ridley's innovation by ordering all the bishops to remove altars and substitute tables "to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel." This arrangement was treated by Elizabeth in the spirit of compromise,¹ and the practice of placing the altar lengthways down the chancel was not successfully resisted until the time of Archbishop Laud.

¹ See pp. 301, 302.

A memorial of this singular arrangement still exists in that rubric of the Communion Office which describes the priest standing at the middle of the altar as "standing at the *north side* of the table"—a prescription which can only harmonize with the present arrangement of the altar when "north side" is interpreted as "west side." It is pleasant to learn that this degradation of the Church's most sacred rite was staunchly resisted by some of the bishops. Day, Bishop of Chichester, refused compliance, and was imprisoned. His fate was shared by Heath of Worcester, who had also offended by refusing to attest the new ordinal with his fellow-commissioners. The most eminent of the imprisoned prelates, Gardiner of Winchester, had recently been offered concessions on condition of his signing a confession of guilt. Gardiner perhaps recalled to mind the signatures wrung from the abbots in Henry's reign. He was wise enough to regard the offer as a snare. As a penalty for his contumacy, he was "removed to a meaner lodging," denied the use of books, pen, ink, and paper "to work his detestable purposes," and formally deprived by a mixed commission of clergy and laymen.

Hardly less eminent among the men of the Old Learning was Toustal, the Bishop of Durham. This prelate's estates were, moreover, a kind of Naboth's vineyard to Northumberland. Toustal had accepted the religious changes ordered by the Council; he therefore escaped for a time. At the end of 1551, when Somerset attempted to regain power, Toustal was imprisoned for alleged complicity in his plot. He was deprived shortly afterwards, and an attempt was made to transfer the greater part of the temporalities of the see to Northumberland. The sees of Westminster and Gloucester had been already plundered.

CHAP.
IX.

More
bishops in
prison.

The sees
robbed.

CHAP.

IX.

Attempt to
coerce the
Princess
Mary.

We may here notice the Council's dealings with another recusant of even more importance than Gardiner. The Princess Mary continued to use the mass. She had acquiesced in the religious changes of Henry's reign, but she was not attracted by the Erastianism of Edward's Council, and she resolutely refused to acknowledge any innovations introduced during the king's minority. The attempt to compel her chaplains to use the Prayer-book was rendered unsuccessful by the interposition of the Emperor Charles V., who vowed that "his cousin should not be worse treated by English councillors than his aunt had been by an English sovereign." When it was understood that the Council must suffer Mary's superstition or go to war, the Reforming bishops, Cranmer, Ridley, and Poyntet, advised toleration as the less of two evils. The annoyances sustained by the princess in the years 1550-51 were nevertheless sufficient to inspire her with that strong hatred of the Reforming party which asserted itself so fearfully five years later. "She had accepted the alterations introduced by her father, and had nothing else intervened she might have maintained as a sovereign what she had honestly admitted as a subject. Her own persecution only, and the violent changes enforced by the doctrinal reformers, taught her to believe that, apart from Rome, there was no security for orthodoxy."¹

Suppres-
sion of
heretics.

Somerset had repealed the ancient laws against heresy simply to gratify the Protestants, the only party that could be taxed with heretical opinions. But so grossly profane and violent was the extreme section of this school during the Eucharistic controversy, that the Protector was forced to build again what he had

¹ Froude, *History*, vol. v. p. 363.

destroyed, and coerce his unmanageable allies by punitive enactments. Hooper and Calvin both attest the turbulence of the sectarians. "How dangerously England is afflicted by heresies God only knows," Hooper writes to Bullinger. . . . There are wretches who dare, in their conventicles, not only to deny that Christ is our Saviour, but to call that Blessed Child a mischief-maker and a deceiver." By Calvin Somerset was advised to inflict the severest penalties on "the fantastical people who, under colour of the Gospel, would set all to confusion," no less than on the papists. To Somerset's credit it may be recorded that the cruel policy suggested by the gloomy Genevan was not accepted. His Heresy Commission only compelled certain anabaptists to abjure and carry faggots at S. Paul's, and imprisoned Joan Bocher. This unhappy person preached an opinion concerning Christ's human nature somewhat akin to Docetism. She was tried in April, 1549, by a commission which included Cranmer and Latimer, and was delivered over to the secular power. She was burnt at Smithfield about a year afterwards, by order of the Council, under a writ *de hæretico comburendo*. The story about Edward reluctantly signing her death-warrant appears to be one of Foxe's myths. The signatures of the Council were sufficient for the warrant, and there is no reason to believe that the king's signature was even asked for. The fate of Joan Bocher was shared in 1551 by George von Paris, a Dutchman of Arian opinions.

Joan
Bocher.

From what has been already stated it will be understood that the Government of this reign systematically stocked the episcopate with divines of the New Learning. If a Reformer could not be found with any claim to distinction, the bishopric was left vacant, and its

CHAP.

IX.

Appoint-
ment of
Hooper to
Gloucester.

revenues were appropriated. We have already mentioned the appointment of the infamous Poynt to Winchester. In July, 1550, Gloucester received a nomination almost as unfortunate. Dr. Hooper was a sincere Christian, who had lived among the continental Calvinists, and so contracted opinions at variance with Anglicanism, even as represented by Cranmer and Ridley. He was recommended to the bishopric by Northumberland, who thought to humour King Edward's Protestant proclivities. The consecration would, of course, be conducted according to the ordinal recently sanctioned by Parliament. The Office which was to be used was substantially that in our present Prayer-book. It included, however, a more impressive ritual. The vestment to be worn by the bishop was a chimere of scarlet; a Bible was to be laid on his neck, and a pastoral staff placed in his hand, at the consecration. Moreover, the oath of supremacy contained the words, "by God, the saints, and the Holy Gospel." These things were an offence to Hooper. The oath was altered in deference to his argument that men ought to swear by God only; but still Hooper was not satisfied. He considered it wrong that a bishop should have a distinctive dress; he would not "be made a magpie of," he disliked the tonsure, he would not have the Bible on his neck. The surplice riots and other anti-ritual movements in our own days have taught us that there is a deep significance in the adoption or rejection of a vestment or a piece of religious ceremonial. It is impossible, therefore, for us to call Hooper's objections puerile. Rather should we argue that he had no appreciation of the dignity of the episcopate, and ought not to have been in the Anglican ministry at all.

His Puritan
scruples.

It must in fairness be added that the bishopric was thrust upon him by Northumberland, unasked for, if not against his wish. What was really perhaps a question of fundamental principle was now narrowed to the petty issue of a ritual dispute. Cranmer, with unwonted firmness, insisted on Hooper's conformity. Ridley also on this occasion appeared on the side of decency and order. Hooper, however, continued to fulminate against chimere, cope, and surplice. He appears to have had the support of Northumberland and the king. An appeal, however, to Bucer, the Protestant luminary, only elicited the unfeeling reply that a vestment was a trivial matter at a time when hypocrisy and infidelity were rampant. Zeal, he urged, should rather be directed to "the staying of sacrilege and the providing decent ministers in the parishes." To a like effect spoke Peter Martyr. Still Hooper was not convinced. He denounced the retention of Catholic usages from the pulpit till he was inhibited from preaching; he then asserted his sentiments in a "Confession of Faith," in which the Council was treated disrespectfully. The Council asked Cranmer to deal with him. The primate could find no better persuasive than incarceration. The "first Puritan confessor" remained in the Fleet prison for nearly two months; he then tendered his submission, and was consecrated in the objectionable vestments on March 8, 1551.

He is imprisoned by Cranmer till he conforms.

Cranmer was now engaged in drawing up a code of Articles which should determine the bounds within which public teaching should be exercised. He was not so presumptuous as to think of imposing on the Church a new "Confession of Faith;" the code was merely intended to check pulpit vagaries. The Forty-two Articles of Cranmer were reshaped in the time of Arch-

The Forty-two Articles.

CHAP.
IX.

A.D. 1553.

bishop Parker, and survive in that syllabus of Thirty-nine Articles to which every preacher of our Church still makes assent. It has frequently been attempted to raise this document to the dignity of a Creed or Confession; such, however, was not the purpose either of Cranmer or Parker. We may add that it will be an evil day for our Church when Articles which are clearly designed only as a security against pulpit extravagance, shall be misinterpreted as the gauge of faith for all members of the Anglican Communion. The Articles were concessory in character—so worded that clergymen who inclined to Calvinism might not be forced to vacate their pulpits. To both extremes of error, however, they presented an uncompromising front. Some are directly aimed at the extravagances of mediæval Romanism, more at the heresies of sixteenth-century Protestantism. In compiling these Articles Cranmer was probably much influenced by the writings of Archbishop Hermann and Melancthon. Of his brother clergy he selected Ridley to assist him. The rights of Convocation were in this, as in other matters, treated by Cranmer with scant deference. The Church's representatives were not summoned to accept the new formulary till after it had been authorized by the king in Council. The Articles were published in May, 1553; the bishops were charged to see that their clergy subscribed them.

The following analysis will show the student how the Articles of 1553 differ from those to which the clergy now declare assent:—

The Forty-two Articles included seven which were omitted in 1563, viz. Art. X., "Of Grace,"—showing that no man can attribute his sinfulness to the constraining influence of predestination; Art. XVI., "Of Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,"

—which is defined as wilful and malicious resistance to the impulses of conscience; Art. XIX., “All men are bound to keep the precepts of the Moral Law,” a part of which Article is retained in our Art. VII.; Art. XXXIX., “The Resurrection of the Dead is not passed already;” Art. XL., “The Souls of men deceased do neither slumber nor perish with their bodies;” Art. XLI., “Of the Millenarians,”—declaring the notion of a millennium to be a Jewish fable; Art. XLII., “All men not to be saved at the last,”—intended to confute such as limited the duration of future punishment.

Instead of these the following four were inserted in 1563 :—Art. V., “Of the Holy Ghost;” Art. XII., “Of Good Works;” Art. XXIX., “Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the Lord’s Supper;” Art. XXX., “Of Communion in both kinds.”

In some of the Articles which are common to both formularies important differences may be discovered. Our references are to the numbering of the Thirty-nine. Art. II. had not the words “begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God.” The spread of Arian opinions among the Protestants induced Archbishop Parker to add this clause in 1563. Art. VI. did not include the catalogue of Old Testament Books. Art. XI. did not define “justification,” but merely referred to the Homily. Art. XX. had not the clause, “The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith.” Art. XXIV. did not condemn “ministering in a tongue not understood,” in such strong terms. Art. XXVIII. differed, perhaps, rather in phraseology than doctrine. It had not the clause, “The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten . . . only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,” but it had a statement as to the impossibility of Christ’s natural body being simultaneously in more places than one, and in confutation of the Transubstantiationists’ it denied “a real and corporal Presence, as they phrase it.” Art. XXXV. necessarily said nothing about the Second Book of Homilies, which was not compiled till Elizabeth’s reign. In the place of this there was an emphatic approval of the ordinal and the recently published “Second Prayer-book.” Art. XXXVII. had not its explanation of the royal supremacy in matters ecclesi-

CHAP.
IX.

astical, and instead thereof was a statement, "The King of England is, after Christ, the supreme head on earth of the Church of England and Ireland."

The
Reforming
Catechism.

A committee of Convocation sanctioned in the same year a Catechism, composed chiefly by Poynet, the disreputable divine who had succeeded to Gardiner's bishopric. This work gives an exposition of the Ten Commandments and the Creed, together with a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, and some other forms of devotion. It says little more about the sacraments, than that they are two in number, and that it is a part of a true Christian's duty to use them. Poynet's Catechism was the basis of Nowel's larger work, a Catechism of a Puritanical and Calvinistic type, from the infliction of which, by authority of Convocation, the Church narrowly escaped under Elizabeth. The Forty-two Articles were published, bound up in one volume, with Poynet's Catechism.

The Second
Prayer-
book.

But the most important production of the last years of this reign was the Second Prayer-book, which an "Act of Uniformity" ordered to be used after November 1, 1552. The continental divines had impugned the Prayer-Pook of 1549 in no measured terms, and Bucer and Peter Martyr drew up, at Cranmer's request, a report of its most prominent faults. Though this report was not followed in the subsequent revision,¹ the modifications now effected in the Communion Office were

¹ We have already remarked that Cranmer had learnt to distrust these captious foreign Protestants. His language, in a letter to the Council with reference to this proposed revision of the Prayer-book, is remarkable: "I trust ye will not be moved with these glorious and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy; and cease not to make trouble when things be most quiet and in good order. If such men should be heard, although the book were made every year anew, yet it should not lack faults in their opinion." The verdict of the foreign Protestants when the Prayer-book of 1552 was issued fully justified Cranmer's anticipations.

doubtless attributable to Protestant influences. Cranmer had passed, at the beginning of the reign, from transubstantiation to consubstantiation. In 1550 he had abandoned the Lutheran dogma and accepted that view of the Eucharist which he maintained consistently henceforward. The "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament," which he published in that year, asserts that there is a real *spiritual* presence conveyed to the believer, but discards many of the dogmas which mediæval theology had built upon this premise. The change of "substance," the *material* or corporeal Presence, even the sacrificial efficacy of the Eucharist, and the receiving of Christ by unworthy partakers, are impugned in this treatise. Cranmer takes, in the main, the same line as the writers who argued against transubstantiation when first that doctrine was broached. The arguments of Peter Martyr and of Ridley, the latter of whom made him acquainted with the so-called "Book of Bertram," John Scotus's treatise against transubstantiation, are said to have effected this change in the primate's opinions. Ridley had probably not halted here, but had embraced views akin to those of the sacramentaries before the publication of the Second Prayer-book. For the changes introduced in the Communion Service of this Second Prayer-book Cranmer and Ridley were mainly responsible, and the influence of the latter appears unfortunately to have overridden that of the more conservative primate. Not only was much that was beautiful in the way of ritual expunged, but John à Lasco's sacramentarian formulæ, "Take and eat this in remembrance," "Drink this in remembrance," now accompanied the presentation of the elements instead of those which asserted the reality of the Saviour's Presence.

CHAP.

IX.

Cranmer's
opinions
modified.

Unfor-
tunate
changes in
Commu-
nion Office.

CHAP.

IX.

Fate of the
Second
Prayer
book. »

The "Act of Uniformity" which enforced the use of this Second Prayer-book was passed in April, 1552. It was so worded as to avoid manifest disparagement of the First Prayer-book, and accounts for the new Office on the ground that "divers doubts and disputes had arisen as to the way in which the book was to be used." It provided penalties of a less severe character than those of the first Act. Happily the inaccuracy of the edition, and the king's anxiety to make further concessions to Protestantism, suggested a suppression of this book before the date when its use became compulsory. It was to come into use on November 1, 1552. But before the end of September there appeared an Order in Council forbidding the issue of more copies. The illness of the king delayed the proposed alterations; on July 6, 1553, he died, and nothing more was heard of the Second Prayer-book till the accession of Elizabeth, who vainly tried to restore the Liturgy of 1549. A compromise appears to have been effected with the revising commissioners. The ancient formulæ of administration appeared in 1552 in conjunction with those of John à Lasco, but the Communion Office was imperfect in the matter of ritual, and the absence of many venerable usages throughout attested the influence of the "Vandal" Liturgy. It was not till 1662 that concessions were made in these respects to the Catholic school.

The
revisions of
the Prayer-
book
compared.

We give here a *résumé* of the most important changes made in 1552, noticing how far these were modified by the revisions of 1559 and 1662.¹

¹ That of 1604 introduced only two important changes. Lay Baptism was no longer sanctioned, and the Catechism received the addition of Dr. Overall's questions and answers on the sacraments: see chap. xiii.

1. In the Morning service the Scripture sentences, "Dearly beloved Brethren," Confession, and Absolution were added. This service had in 1549 opened with the Lord's Prayer, as did the Evening service until 1662.

2. In the Communion Office the Ten Commandments were added. No prayers or oblations for the dead were prescribed; the prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church" received in its title the significant addition "*militant here on earth*," and the words which commemorate the faithful departed were not added till 1662. The prescription to add to the wine "a little pure and clean water" was omitted from the rubric. At administration the second only of the two clauses now in use was to be employed in the case of both elements. The first clauses were reinserted in 1559. The directions as to the priest's manipulation of the elements during the act of consecration had also disappeared. These were not restored till 1662. The rubric of 1549 had ordered "unleavened bread." That of 1552 says that "it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten with other meats." This was supplemented in 1559 by an "Injunction" ordering the use of wafer bread, "made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon." Lastly, in 1662 came the present rubric. This in order to take away from the Puritans "all occasion of dissension and superstition" allows the alternative, *scil.* "it shall suffice¹ that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." The rubric apologizing for the act of kneeling first appears in 1552. It was omitted, as derogatory to the dignity of the Sacrament, in 1559, but restored, for the instruction of the Puritans, in 1662. The rubric directing the Minister to read the Lord's Prayer and Collect standing on the "north side" (see p. 227) also dates from 1552.

3. The Office of Baptism no longer prescribed a form of adjuration or exorcism, nor the ancient practice of trine immersion, nor the investiture of the baptized with the white dress called the chrisom. Neither of the two first Prayer-books had any prayer for the sanctification of the water. This deficiency was met in 1662 by the insertion of the prayer "Almighty and everlasting God."

¹ A rubric the purport of which was discovered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1871 to be a prohibition of wafer bread.

CHAP.

IX.

4. In Confirmation the prayer at the laying on of hands was introduced. In the Prayer-book of 1549, instead of a prayer, there was this address: "N., I sign thee with the sign of the cross and lay my hands upon thee, In the name, etc."

5. In the "Solemnization of Matrimony" the giving of gold and silver with the ring was no longer prescribed. The rubric still ordered the reception of Holy Communion on the very day of marriage. It was not altered to its present form till 1662.

6. In the "Visitation of the Sick" the formula at anointing the sick person "upon the forehead or breast" was omitted, and the practice no longer prescribed. In other parts of the service there were several unimportant verbal alterations made both now and in 1662.

7. In the "Burial of the Dead" the Psalms of 1549 (Psalms cxvi., cxxxix., cxlvi.) were omitted, and it was not till 1662 that their place was supplied by Psalms xxxix. and xc. The portion of the service following the Lesson took its present form. In 1549 there had been a prayer for the forgiveness and acceptance of the departed soul, followed by a celebration of Holy Communion with special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

8. The ordinal attached to the Prayer-book of 1549 had been altered in deference to Puritan scruples. The Office incorporated in the Prayer-book of 1552 was almost identical with our present Ordination Service. Besides appeals to saints and evangelists, certain symbolical practices had been omitted, viz. the laying a Bible on the *neck* of a bishop and placing a pastoral staff in his hands, and the delivering of a chalice and bread at the ordination of a priest.

9. The Vestment or Ornament rubric at the beginning of the book now ordered that the minister should use "neither alb, vestment, nor cope," but that, being a bishop, he should wear a rochet, and being a priest or deacon, a surplice. This restriction was abolished in 1559, and the rubric henceforth ordered (as it does still) the use of such vestments as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.

Foreign
divines still
dissatisfied.

This Prayer-book of 1552 might well be regarded as an extravagant concession to the destructive faction. After the manner of such concessions, it gave most

offence to the party whose opinions were deferred to. The foreign refugees abused the new Prayer-book as virulently as they had abused that of 1549, and Calvin himself aspersed it as "intolerable stuff," "intolerable fooleries."

It will be remembered that when Henry's ecclesiastical changes were imminent, an Act of Parliament had appointed thirty-two commissioners to undertake the revision of ecclesiastical "constitutions, ordinances, and canons" (1534). Various causes had hitherto hindered the completion of this work. In November, 1551, a new commission was appointed. It contained eight persons, among whom were the foreigners, Peter Martyr and John à Lasco, and was presided over by Cranmer. The labours of this commission resulted in a work of Puritanical character, entitled "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*." Before this production was submitted to Parliament and Convocation, King Edward had died. A proposal made in 1571 to give it legal authority fell through, and the Church thus escaped the infliction of a code which would have isolated us both from other branches of the Church and from our own national traditions. This work was pretentious in appearance. It was distributed into fifty-one sections, in imitation of Justinian's digest of Roman law, and had an appendix, "*De regulis juris*," corresponding to the supplementary "*Pandects*" of Justinian. Dean Hook regards this publication as in the main Cranmer's handiwork, and as throwing a clear light on the theological opinions of the primate at the end of Edward's reign. "As the foundation of all ecclesiastical law he introduces the king as commanding all his subjects, everywhere and under every denomination, to be Christians"—a position quite in accordance with

The
"Refor-
matio
Legum."

CHAP.

IX.

the Erastian character of Cranmer's theology. Those who deny fundamental doctrines, such as that of the Blessed Trinity, ought, according to the "Reformatio," to be burnt; smaller forms of heresy should be visited by the magistrate with less severe penalties. The "Reformatio" treats predestination and election from a Lutheran standpoint, despite the Thirty-nine Articles, and gives to the Sacraments and to Holy Orders their true dignity, despite the new Prayer-book.

Commis-
sion of
search for
Church
property.

The last incident of note in this unhappy reign was an attempt to repair the mischief of the ultra-Protestants. Commissioners were appointed in June, 1552, to make search for the valuables that had been embezzled from monasteries, chantries, and colleges. They were to leave in every church such chalices and cups and other ornaments as they should think requisite for divine service; the rest of the property was to be appropriated to the Crown. This arrangement compelled the plunderers to disgorge, but to the increment of the Exchequer rather than of Church revenues. The episcopal sees had now nearly all been robbed by means of enforced alienations, and the clergy were mostly in a state of abject poverty. Numerous parishes were altogether without curates. The poor were unfriended, the churches lapsing to decay. Learning had forsaken the universities. Corruption and intrigue were rife at Court. Harsh laws and heavy taxation were making life unendurable to all but the ministerial parasites. Such was the state to which the Reformation brought England when it was conducted under Protestant auspices.

CHAPTER X.

Mary.

A.D. 1553-1558.

Northumberland's conspiracy—Its failure—Enthusiastic reception of Mary—Anti-Reformers regain influence—Disturbances in churches—Royal proclamation issued—The queen negotiates with Rome—The impediments to reunion—Medievalism in the ascendant—Flight of the foreign refugees—And of many English Reformers—Cranmer remains—His indiscreet manifesto—Is imprisoned in the Tower—Other Reforming bishops share his fate—Parliament—The religious status of 1547 restored—Cranmer's proceedings in the divorce case exposed—Henry's Treasons Acts and Præmunires taken off—Convocation reactionary—The public disputation—The proposed marriage with Philip—Protestant denunciations—The second flight of Protestants and Reformers—More royal "Injunctions"—Six bishops deprived—And about fifteen hundred married priests—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer at Oxford—The disputation in the schools—Unfair conduct of their censors—Their condemnation—Manifesto of other imprisoned divines—The queen's religion insulted—The royal marriage—More negotiations with Rome—The bargain concluded—Pole returns to England—The verdict of England—The ultra-Protestants accountable for the lapse—The reconciliation—Pole's speech—Submission of the Houses—Their apology—The nation is absolved—The clergy are absolved—They plead for restoration of Church property—But this is not in the bond—Pole's appeal to the lay impropiator's conscience—The Act—Extends clerical liberties—But justifies lay impropriation—Pole's other concessions—The laws for destruction of heretics revived—Hitherto no heretics burnt—The Marian persecution unintelligible—It caused the Elizabethan reaction—The blame rests with the Spanish ecclesiastics—Not with the English bishops—Account of these ecclesiastics—Philip's share in the matter—The persecuting gentry—The first commission—Irritation of the populace—The three bishops at Oxford—Ridley and Latimer burnt—Career of Ridley—Career of Latimer—Cranmer reserved for six months—He is induced to recant—Renounces his recantations—And is burnt—Mary restored the royal impropriations—Elizabeth cancelled this act of generosity—Re-establishment of unreformed religion—Persecution continues—Pole forced to head the persecution—The Pope's attack on Pole resented by Mary—Convocation in 1558—Hatred of Romanism—Death of Mary and many bishops.

THE mortal sickness of Edward warned Northumberland that his day of power was drawing to a close. A Northumberland's conspiracy.

CHAP.

X.

desperate expedient suggested itself as the only means of averting downfall. Edward's strong religious prejudices might be so worked upon that the throne should be bequeathed by a royal will to Lady Jane Grey, lately married to Northumberland's own son, Lord Guildford Dudley. Between the Lady Jane and the succession there came four persons: the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth; the infant daughter of Margaret, niece of Henry VIII., who had married James IV. of Scotland; and Lady Jane's mother, the Duchess of Suffolk. Mary, the first in succession according to Henry's will, had been declared a bastard by an unrepealed Act of Parliament; so also had Elizabeth; the next claimant might be passed over as an infant; the duchess was ready to waive her claim in favour of her daughter. Henry had left the crown by will; the ministerial clique assured Edward that he had power to do so too. The most telling argument with the young king was, doubtless, the pronounced Protestantism of the Lady Jane. Edward disinherited his sisters and appointed his cousin his successor. Many of the councillors who attested the necessary legal instrument did so under protest; the last and most reluctant to sign was Archbishop Cranmer. On the death of Edward, Lady Jane was proclaimed queen in London, much against her own inclination (July 10). Ridley and the anti-Roman divines preached in behalf of her claim.

Its failure.

But the nation was wearied of injustices perpetrated in the name of the New Learning; the true motive of the proceeding was patent to all, and Mary at once found herself surrounded by partisans. In ten days the scheme had proved itself futile. Arundel, Shrewsbury, Pembroke, and others of the Council declared for Mary; Northumberland was forced to disband his

troops at Cambridge; and twenty-seven of the party, including Bishop Ridley, found their way to the Tower. Mary was only merciless to offenders in the matter of religion. On the present occasion she showed a clemency which, in the opinion of her cousin, the emperor, outstepped the bounds of prudence. The lives of Lady Jane and her husband were spared till the insurrection under Wyatt in the following year made continued leniency impossible. Justice was for the present satisfied with the lives of the arch-conspirator and two leading members of the faction. The duke's execution was memorable for his renunciation on the scaffold of those Protestant principles which he had disgraced in office. In the prospect of deliverance from such iniquitous government as had prevailed since the death of Henry, the Romanist proclivities of the new queen were condoned by the vast majority of her subjects. Her entry into London was greeted with extraordinary enthusiasm. Her popularity did not diminish when she began her administration by restoring the currency to its proper value at her own cost, and remitting a subsidy granted to the Crown by the late Parliament.

CHAP.
X.

Enthusiastic
reception of
Mary.

The queen had announced in Suffolk that she did not intend to coerce her subjects in the matter of religion. The change of dynasty, however, necessarily altered the fortunes of the two parties. The release of the five incarcerated prelates, Gardiner, Tonstal, Bonner, Day, and Heath, was a mere act of justice. A committee was appointed to examine the charges against these prisoners. It pronounced that their deposition was unjust. They accordingly recovered possession of their respective sees. Gardiner and the Duke of Norfolk were soon members of the Privy

Anti-Reformers
regain
influence.

Council, wherein, from motives of policy, were retained most of those in Edward's Council who had not declared for Jane. Cranmer was, of course, in disgrace. He was permitted, however, to read the funeral service of the Prayer-book over King Edward in Westminster Abbey, while Gardiner celebrated the mass of the unreformed faith in the Tower chapel. This concession to the Reformed party was secured by the arguments of the emperor, who advised that all religious changes should be effected with the greatest caution. After the obsequies, the archbishop received an order to confine himself to his house at Lambeth.

Disturb-
ances in
churches.

A decided collision between the two schools of thought was, however, inevitable. On the one hand, the conservative clergy had in many places hastened to restore the ancient rites, with no warrant but the well-known religious proclivity of the throne. The Calvinists, on the other hand, reading less accurately the signs of the times, vented their dissatisfaction in those acts of turbulence which, in the recent reign, had passed as indications of godly zeal. Some London Protestants raised a riot while mass was being celebrated at a church in the horse-market. A more serious affair took place at S. Paul's Cross, while Bourne, one of the royal chaplains, was preaching. Bourne indiscreetly complained of the religious innovations of Edward's reign, especially dwelling on the unjust treatment experienced by Bishop Bonner. A tumult ensued, in the course of which a fanatic hurled a dagger, which struck one of the columns of the pulpit. The preacher with difficulty escaped, under the protection of Bradford and Rogers, two of the Reformed clergy. The queen perceived that immediate steps must be taken to enforce order. Following the

example of her two predecessors, she adopted the expedient of silencing the pulpits by royal injunction. In her proclamation she complained of the use of "the devilish terms of papist and heretic," and similar indications of religious animosity. She declared plainly that, for her part, she intended to cling to the religion in which she had been brought up, and that she would gladly see her subjects inclined thereto. Nevertheless, "her Highness minds not to compel any her said subjects thereunto, until such time as further order by common consent may be taken therein." For the present the proclamation required a special licence, not only for preaching, but also, since these had been used as a means of insulting the old ritual, for plays and interludes. Meanwhile, Mary was engaged in secret negotiations with Rome. Julius III. had despatched his chamberlain Commendone to England, to pave the way for the restoration of the papal supremacy in England. The envoy passed himself off in London as an Italian gentleman, who had come over in search of a property recently bequeathed by a kinsman. He was thus enabled to study unobserved the position and prospects of the two religious parties. The queen admitted him to interviews which were kept secret even from her confidential adviser, Renard, the emperor's ambassador. The prospect was not yet regarded as satisfactory to the Roman faction, notwithstanding the general reaction; and it was decided that the papal appointment of Cardinal Pole¹ as legate to

CHAP.

X.

Royal pro-
clamation
issued.
Aug. 1553.

The queen
negotiates
with Rome.

¹ Cardinal Pole, who plays such an important part in this reign, has been mentioned as denouncing, in the *De Unitate*, Henry's assumption of ecclesiastical supremacy and the judicial murders of Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher. This work caused a sensation on the Continent, and Pole was ordered to return to England. Wisely disobeying, he secured the favour of Paul III., and, although not in priest's orders, was made a cardinal in December, 1536. He appears to have been mixed up in all the foreign conspiracies against Henry VIII. He was

CHAP.

X.

The im-
pediments
to reunion.

Mediæval-
ism in the
ascendant.

England should as yet be kept secret. The two great obstacles, in Mary's opinion, were that "the greater part" of the people "had a mortal hatred of the Holy See,"¹ and that the aristocracy were possessed of ecclesiastical property which they would not consent to resign. The old English antipathy to Roman usurpation Mary was enabled to surmount; the more matter-of-fact arguments of the holders of Church property were unassailable. Romanism was eventually restored, on the distinct understanding that the Pope winked at the spoliation of the preceding reigns.

The royal proclamation sufficiently indicated which side might transgress with impunity, and the restoration of the Latin mass and other Roman Offices went on apace. Most religious laymen were sick of the irreverence and disorder which appeared at this time to be the necessary concomitants of reformation. The indifferent mostly desired the system that would best enhance the prosperity of the country, and, tried by this test, the Reformed cause was hopelessly disparaged. Among the clergy and the middle classes alone was there much real appreciation of the religious benefits of the Reformation. In both these quarters much would have to be unlearned ere the tide of public sympathy could turn in their favour. All doubt in this matter was removed when the writs went out this autumn for an election to Parliament. The writs named, as usual, a limited number of candidates for

declared an outlaw in 1539. His mother, the Countess of Salisbury, was executed shortly afterwards. On the death of Henry he wrote to the Privy Council, defending his conduct and offering to reconcile England to Rome. With Mary, Pole had been intimate from childhood, and the hope of gaining her in marriage is supposed to have kept him a deacon. It will be remembered Pole was very nearly related to the reigning family. His mother was daughter of the Duke of Clarence, brother to Edward IV., and first cousin to Elizabeth, the consort of Henry VII.

¹ Julius III. to Pole, *Poli Epistolæ*, vol. iv.

each constituency, but the elections of this reign appear to have been singularly free from bribery and corruption—as compared, at least, with those under Edward VI. The body returned seems to have fairly represented the convictions of the upper classes on the religious question. It was, as will be seen, strongly in favour of undoing the Reformation. It is not surprising that many of the Reforming teachers now found their posts untenable. Oxford became too hot to hold Peter Martyr, and this apostle of foreign Protestantism was fain to seek a more congenial clime under a safe conduct from Gardiner. John à Lasco, the hierarch of the refugee sectaries in London, received an order to break up his congregation and go. The mayors of Rye and Dover were charged to permit the exit of all such French Protestants as had not been outlawed. The hint was taken by many, and on divers pretexts several of the English Reformed clergy joined this exodus. In the course of the next two years hundreds of our countrymen¹ migrated to the continental towns. Strasburg, Frankfort, Basle and Geneva, Arau and Zurich, were the chief cities of refuge. The Lutherans, shocked at the low sacramental views of the Second Prayer-book, disowned these English refugees; by the Calvinists and Zuinglians they were received for a time with open arms. The spirit of sectarianism soon interrupted their harmony. Most continued loyal to the religious formularies of Edward's reign; some, however, were infected by the contentious and disorderly temper of their asylums. Goaded by the foreign sectaries, these persons discovered in the

Flight of
the foreign
refugees.

And of
many
English
Reformers.

¹ The most notable names among these refugees are Poynt, Bishop of Winchester, Barlow of Bath and Wells, Scory of Chichester, Coverdale of Exeter, and Bale of Ossory; Deans Cox, Haddon, Horn, Turner, and Sampson; Grindal, afterwards primate, Jewel, and Sandys.

CHAP.
X.

doctrines of free grace and predestination, and in the use of forms, habits, and ceremonies, a fertile source of discord. The return of these emigrants, on the accession of Elizabeth, brought into England that snare of Puritanism which was destined to hamper her Church's future progress.

Cranmer
remains.

No one had better reasons for consulting his safety than Archbishop Cranmer. Apart from his mismanagement of the Reformation, he was a doomed man on the score of political intrigues. If his share in Northumberland's recent conspiracy could be overlooked, the part he had taken against the queen's mother could not. Cranmer, however, thought it his wisdom or his duty to remain at his post. He was summoned and examined before the Council with reference to Northumberland's plot, but experienced no greater severity than an order to remain at Lambeth. His own indiscretion, however, soon offered a pretext for sharper procedure. A personal enemy, Thornton, Bishop-suffragan of Dover, had spread a report that the restoration of the mass at Canterbury Cathedral had the primate's sanction. The archbishop could not content himself with a plain denial of the story. There appeared a manifesto as objectionably intemperate as any of his attacks on Gardiner in the palmy days of Edward VI. It was not he, says the primate, "but a false, flattering, lying, and dissembling monk," who had restored the mass at Canterbury. "The devil," he observes, "now endeavours to restore the Latin satisfactory masses, a thing of his own intention and device. . . . The mass discovers a plain contradiction to antiquity and the inspired writings, and is stuffed over and above with many horrid blasphemies. . . . As the devil is a liar and the father of lying, so he

 indiscreet
manifesto.
Sept. 1553.

has now stirred up his servants to persecute Christ and His true religion." It is only fair to Cranmer to surmise that these unseasonable and offensive denunciations may not all have been intended for publication. An officious friend, Scory, Bishop of Chichester, saw the manifesto preparing in the primate's house, transcribed it, and without permission gave it general circulation. But it was impossible for Cranmer to disown it, or for the queen to overlook the insult to her religion. On September 8 the primate found himself in the Tower, on a charge of treason by complicity with Northumberland, aggravated "by spreading seditious bills and moving tumults to the disquiet of the State." On November 13 he was brought to trial for his share in Lady Jane's usurpation: he expressed penitence, and was pardoned on this count. The queen, however, relegated him to prison, and refused his request that he might address her on religious topics. It soon became apparent that the prelates of the Old Learning had vacated their prisons in favour of their Reformed brethren. Ridley was already in the Marshalsea for turbulent preaching; Hooper and Coverdale were committed to the Fleet on the same charge; Latimer was brought before the Council, and appears to have given offence by his characteristic bluntness of speech. He was imprisoned in the Tower for "seditious demeanour." To the Tower also went Holgate, Archbishop of York, a Reforming prelate of a very different stamp, whose morals were as bad as Bishop Poyntet's, and whose nefarious jobbings with the late Governments had seriously injured his see. It may be noticed that, after Cranmer's attainder, the see of Canterbury was declared void, although he was not formally degraded till 1556. In the interim

CHAP.
X.

Is imprisoned in the
Tower.

Other
Reforming
bishops
share his
fate.

CHAP.
X.

the archiepiscopal jurisdiction was exercised by the commissioners of the dean and chapter.

Parliament.

We have mentioned the election of this autumn and the return of a Parliament opposed to Protestantism. The session opened, as in olden time, with a solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost. The Council broached a scheme for repealing all Acts of the two last reigns bearing on religion, and thus precipitately restoring the papal supremacy. But it became plain that such retrogression would not be acceptable to the Lower House. What this body desired was the Reformation as Henry left it, *i.e.* Catholicism minus the Pope and plus Church spoil. This standard was regained by means of a bill for regulating public worship. The bill repealed all the religious measures of Edward's reign, denounced the Reformed Liturgy as "a new thing imagined and devised by a few of singular opinions," and ordered the re-establishment, after December 20, 1553, of "all such divine service and administration of the sacraments which were most commonly used in the last year of Henry VIII." Only about a third of the Lower House offered opposition to these measures. By another bill the legitimacy of the queen was established. The plain truth respecting the divorce was now for the first time published with authority. The bill declared how the universities abroad and at home had been bribed and menaced; how "Thomas Cranmer, then newly made Archbishop of Canterbury, most ungodly, and against all laws of equity and conscience," called the case before him *ex officio*; and how, "taking his foundation partly from his own unadvised judgment of the Scripture," and partly from the pretended testimonies of the universities, and partly "from bare and most untrue

The
religious
status of
1547
restored.

Cranmer's
proceedings
in the
divorce
case
exposed.

conjectures," he proceeded to pronounce the divorce, "without admitting or hearing anything that could be said by the queen . . . or by any on her behalf."

Another bill swept away the hateful Treasons Acts, which Henry had introduced to guard his pretended ecclesiastical supremacy. All treasons were reduced to the statute of 25 Edw. III. cap. 2, and all *præmunire* established since 1 Hen. VIII. was abolished.

CHAP.
X.

Henry's
Treasons
Acts and
Præmunire
taken off.

The same reactionary spirit was manifested in the new Convocation. Two resolutions, drawn up by Weston the prolocutor, were laid before the Lower House: the one asserted the presence of Christ's natural body in the Eucharist; the other repudiated the volume containing the Catechism and Forty-two Articles. Only five dissentient voices were raised. The five demanded the popular panacea for difference in religious opinions—a public disputation. A four days' bout accordingly took place in the presence of many of the nobility. The dogma of transubstantiation was, as usual, the point assailed by the Reforming champions.¹ The controversy was without practical results.

Convoca-
tion re-
actionary.

The public
disputa-
tion.

The queen had from the first determined to accept Philip of Spain as her husband. Gardiner vainly remonstrated, urging the offence this alliance would give to France, the personal unpopularity of the prince, and Englishmen's ineradicable antipathy to Spain. The forecast of the chancellor was justified by Wyatt's insurrection in February, 1554. The Protestant fanatics made use of the occasion, and the rebellion was defended in pamphlets of the old Lollard tone, denouncing popery as worse than heathenism, proving from Scripture the propriety of exterminating tyrants, and even arguing

The pro-
posed
marriage
with Philip.

Protestant
denuncia-
tions.

¹ A résumé of the arguments may be found in Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vi. p. 39, seq.

CHAP.

X.

The second
flight of
Protestants
and
Reformers.

More
royal "In-
junctions,"
March,
1554.

that all absolute authority was the invention of the devil. One of these treatises has been attributed to Bishop Poynt. Mary, however, rightly regarded the French Protestants as the main source of such propaganda, and an order was now issued that all the refugees should leave the kingdom within twenty-four days. Again a number of the English Reformers accompanied the exiles.

Mary appears to have had the true Tudor propensity to extend the regale. Until she formally transferred the supremacy to the Pope the Church had scarcely more liberty of action than under Henry and Edward. March, 1554, produced a batch of royal "Injunctions," which the bishops were to put in force. It was ordered that all the ancient ceremonies, holy days, and canons should be restored; that the bishops should do their utmost to suppress heresy and stop the circulation of scandalous books and ballads; that all married priests should be deprived, or else be separated from their wives; and that those who had broken a monastic vow by marriage should be formally divorced and also punished. Strangely enough, considering their only warrant was the royal supremacy, these "Injunctions" relieved the clergy from the oath of primacy or succession, and expunged from all future episcopal instruments or processes the words "*regia auctoritate fulcitus*."

Six bishops
deprived.

The "Injunctions" were no *brutum fulmen*. Ten days after their publication, a commission was issued to Gardiner and others to deprive four prelates who had broken a monastic vow in marrying—Holgate of York, Ferrar of S. David's, Bird of Chester, and Bush of Bristol—and to inflict on them such penance as should seem proper. The same commissioners were also deputed to deal with the persons who "named them-

selves" Bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Hereford, viz. Taylor, Hooper, and Harley. These bishops had been nominated by letters patent of Edward VI., containing the proviso "*quamdiu se bene gesserint.*" It was argued that they had not acquitted themselves well, either in respect of doctrine or behaviour, and that they might therefore be deprived. Appointments by *congé d'élire* soon filled six of the vacant sees with prelates of a more satisfactory type. The married priests appear to have been given a year of grace to abjure their heresy and put away their wives. There has been much controversy as to the number actually deprived. Dr. Lingard admits that they may have been as many as fifteen hundred, nearly a sixth part of the whole clerical body. None of the deprived were compelled to separate from their wives unless they had before marriage taken the monastic vow. How many of the married clergy qualified themselves for continuance of tenure by divorce is not recorded.

And about
fifteen
hundred
married
priests.

Complaints had been made by the Reforming party that their views had not been allowed a fair hearing at the recent disputation. It was to silence this charge, and possibly, too, with the baser purpose of wreaking vengeance on the leaders of King Edward's Reformation, that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were moved to Oxford and compelled to announce their religious opinions in public (April, 1554). Three crucial propositions had been selected: (1) In the Eucharist, after consecration, there are present the human Body and Blood of Christ; (2) No other substance but these remains; (3) The mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for living and dead. Convocation and the two universities had been authorized by the queen's letters to form a committee for conducting the con-

Cranmer,
Ridley, and
Latimer
at Oxford.

CHAP.
X.

troversy. Eight divines represented Oxford, and six the sister university. None of them were of episcopal rank, so that the Church now witnessed the anomaly of a metropolitan and two bishops tried by a committee of priests. The imprisoned prelates, of course, impugned all the three propositions cited. They were thereupon told that they must defend their views in a public controversy. Only two days were allowed them to prepare for this ordeal, and the three prelates were unprovided with books. Latimer, who was never a theologian, and was now in extreme old age, declared he was as fit to dispute in public as to be the captain of Calais. The three were to appear in the schools singly, each for one day. Cranmer was summoned first, on April 16. The line taken by the prelates was that of the ancient Catholic doctors, and the rationalistic view to which one at least of the three had inclined at the end of Edward's reign was not even mentioned. Many modern Protestants would find the taint of popery in the principles which Cranmer defended as the teaching of the primitive Church. The presence of Christ, he urged, was real, but spiritual. The dogma which insisted on the presence of the natural Body of the Saviour involved numerous paradoxes and sophistries. That exaltation of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist which had substituted for the Communion a propitiatory mass Cranmer considered to be derogatory to the sacrifice on Calvary.

The dis-
putation in
the schools.

Unfair
conduct of
their
opponents

The prelates would doubtless have made a more successful defence, had they been given a fair hearing. Their speeches, it appears, were continually interrupted by the clamour of their opponents; who did not hesitate to indulge in indecent language and gestures, and

who aimed at prejudicing the mob of auditors against the accused, rather than at maintaining a serious defence of the three propositions. Weston, who presided, himself gave vent to personal reflections of a most unseemly kind. The end of this disputation at Oxford was that the bishops were summoned to S. Mary's on April 20, where, having finally refused to subscribe the Articles, they were condemned to be guilty of heresy. They were relegated to an imprisonment of greater rigour. Six other leading divines of the Reformed party were now in prison, viz. Hooper, Rogers, Philpot, Bradford, Crome, and Taylor. It appears that the dominant party meditated securing another easy triumph by summoning them to a similar ordeal at Cambridge. Warned by the character of the proceedings in the Oxford schools, these divines issued a paper in which they declined public disputation conducted under such auspices, and defined their theological opinions in a series of Articles. In this manifesto the four first Councils are acknowledged as authoritative. Justification is declared to be effected by faith, but faith is carefully distinguished from religious theory. The line taken with regard to the sacraments is not so satisfactory. It is declared that they are not sacraments at all when they are used for illegitimate purposes, or in a different manner than that appointed by the Saviour. As instances of such misuse, the divines denounce communion in one kind, the dogma of transubstantiation, the maintaining the mass to be a sacrifice for quick and dead. Using the illiberal language by which the men of this school so frequently discredited their cause, they attribute these errors to "Antichrist." To the same source is traced the prohibition of clerical marriages.

CHAP.

X.

Their condemnation.

Manifesto of other imprisoned divines.

CHAP.
X.

The queen's
religion
insulted.

If divines in prison could speak thus boldly, it is not surprising that the adherents of the Reformed system in the lower orders adopted less equivocal methods of insulting the re-established faith. A girl was employed to utter denunciations of Mary through a wall near Aldersgate, and her voice was passed off as that of a spirit. At Cheapside, a cat dressed in priestly fashion was found hanging on a gallows. Dr. Pendilton, who had complained of this insult, was shot at with a pistol near S. Paul's. Prayers were put up that "God would turn Queen Mary's heart from idolatry, or else shorten her days." An impostor was even suborned to represent Edward VI. Such conduct, if it did not suggest, to some extent palliates the subsequent adoption by Mary of a sanguinary policy towards the party in opposition.

The royal
marriage.

In July, 1554, the queen was married to Philip at Winchester Cathedral, by Bishop Gardiner. As an attempt to ingratiate himself with his new subjects, the king obtained concessions for the prisoners in the Tower. Archbishop Holgate was released; so were Courtenay and some knights who had been concerned in Wyatt's rebellion; and the Princess Elizabeth was subjected henceforward to less rigorous restraint. But nothing could surmount the national prejudice against Spain, and the marriage lost little of its odium. General approval, however, was bestowed on the queen's exertions to reunite the English Church with that of Rome. The appointment of a papal legate had not been made public till the temper of the upper classes had been thoroughly ascertained. It was found that there was a yearning for reconciliation with the Apostolic see, qualified by a much stronger determination not to cede the Church lands confiscated in the

More nego-
tiations
with Rome.

two last reigns. These had, in the first instance, been bestowed on the court favourites, but had since been divided and transferred to such an extent that their restoration would have damaged innumerable interests. On this point hinged the chief difficulty of reconciliation with Rome. Bishop Gardiner had been foremost in repudiating papal supremacy under Henry VIII., and was by no means as eager as Mary for its re-establishment. He insisted on a guarantee that the question of alienated Church property should not be hereafter opened. Pope Julius, on the other hand, was averse to making this concession unconditionally. It would be a shocking precedent if the rebellious subjects of the Holy See were pardoned on such terms. He attempted to hoodwink Gardiner, by burdening the legate with the required pledge, reserving his own liberty of action. Pole meantime complained piteously that "Peter" had been vainly "knocking at the door of Mary" for a whole year. The wary chancellor perhaps recalled how Peter had duped Henry VIII. on the occasion of the divorce question; he remained deaf to all expostulation. A bull was thus wrung from Pope Julius, giving Pole full power to "give, relieve, and transfer" all Church property to its present holders. Assured of the good will of his countrymen, and burning with zeal for their religious welfare, Pole tarried not for the repeal of his attainder, but boldly set sail for England.

If the proceedings which now took place be considered disgraceful, the disgrace must be attached not to one estate or order of men, but to the enfranchised classes in the aggregate. Six weeks before Pole landed, writs had been issued for an election to Parliament. It was known that the national representatives would be asked to re-establish papal supremacy. There was

CHAP.

X.

The
bargain
concluded.

Pole
returns to
England.
Nov. 20,
1554.

The verdict
of England.

CHAP.
X.

little or no coercion on the part of the court. The queen appears to have contented herself with issuing circulars with the writs, contradicting the false report that in the scheme for reunion "alteration was intended of any man's possessions." There is no reason to doubt that the returns indicated the prevalent opinion of the educated classes. The verdict was all but unanimous. When on November 29 the new Commons was asked whether the country should accept papal absolution on condition of abrogating Henry's statutes of emancipation, there were two dissentients in a House of three hundred and sixty. The test is the more remarkable if we accept the stories of Mary's personal unpopularity. Without intimidation and without cajolery, England gave her voice in favour of Romanism. Rather than sink in the quagmire of inorganic Protestantism, she would clasp the treacherous hand of a papal legate. The proceeding was perhaps disgraceful, certainly disastrous, to the nation. But we can condemn none but those religious teachers who had made the cause of Reformation odious.

The ultra-Protestants accountable for the lapse.

The reconciliation.

It is affecting to read the account of the outlawed cardinal's return, and the most prejudiced can realize the joy which for a while irradiated the gloomy path of Mary Tudor, as she reaped the firstfruits of her labours. The Lords and Commons first met the legate informally in the great chamber at Whitehall on November 28. Pole, in his address, thanked them for the recent repeal of his attainder (which had been carried in the Houses on the 23rd), and declared his desire to requite the favour in kind by restoring to England her patent of religious nobility. Remarking how early this island had received the Christian faith, and how cordial in former times had been its relations

Pole's speech.

with the Apostolic see, he came to the topic of the recent "English revolt." Of this he said, with sufficient show of justice, that "avarice and sensuality were its principal motives, and that it was first started and carried out by the unbridled appetites and licentiousness of a single person." That Mary had outlived the machinations and devices of her foes, and now reigned united to a Romanist prince, he attributed to the singular Providence of God. As the Almighty had conferred on Philip and Mary the supreme imperial power, so had He conferred on the Apostolic see the "power of keys and orders in the ecclesiastical state." These keys, however, the legate could not as yet use, "not for want of power in me to give, but for certain impediments in you to receive, which must be taken away before my commission can take effect. . . . The mean whereby you shall receive this benefit is to revoke and repeal those laws and statutes which be impediments, blocks, and bars to the execution of my commission." Thus candidly did the legate lay before England the price of her absolution. There was no misunderstanding the terms of the contract, and no hesitation in accepting them. Gardiner spoke the feeling of the Houses when he exclaimed, as Pole withdrew, "A prophet has the Lord raised up among us from among our brethren, and he shall save us." The repeal of the obnoxious Acts would, however, take some time, and both sides deprecated further delay. The Houses promised to repeal the Acts hereafter; the legate consented to honour the pledge by granting immediate absolution. In the House of Lords this arrangement was accepted *nem. con.*; in the Commons, Sir Ralph Bagenall protested that he "had sworn to King Henry's laws, and he would keep his oath." He and one other member

Submission
of the
Houses.

CHAP.
X.Their
apology.The nation
is absolved.
Nov. 30,
1554.

gave an adverse vote. A joint petition was drawn up by the Houses, declaring their penitence, and imploring absolution. The climax was reached on St. Andrew's Day, 1554, when, after attending high mass at Westminster Abbey, the two Houses assembled at Whitehall to give final effect to the concordat. Gardiner, as the chancellor, presented the petition, wherein the Lords and Commons declare themselves "very sorry and repentant for the schism and disobedience committed . . . against the said see Apostolic, either by making, agreeing to, or executing any laws, ordinances, or commandments against the supremacy of the said see, or otherwise doing or speaking what might impugn the same." The petitioners promise "to do that which shall be in us for the abrogation and repealing of the said laws and ordinances in this present Parliament." A "most humble suit" is presented "that we may obtain from the see Apostolic, by the said most reverend Father, as well particularly as universally, absolution, release, and discharge from all such censures as by the laws of the Church we be fallen in; and that we may, as penitent children, be received into the bosom and unity of Christ's Church; so as this noble realm, with all the members thereof, may in unity and perfect obedience to the see Apostolic and Pope for the time being, serve God and your Majesties to the furtherance and advancement of His honour and glory." Pole, in a few dignified expressions, congratulated the English nation on its repentance. He then rose; the whole assembly knelt. The dead silence was broken by a few solemn words of absolution, concluding, "We do absolve and deliver you and every of you, with this whole realm and the dominions thereof, from all heresy and schism, and from all and

every judgment, censure, and pain for that cause incurred; and we do restore you again into the unity of our mother the Holy Church, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." *Te Deums*, masses, processions, and days of jubilee throughout the whole Roman dominion celebrated the relapse of England to "popery."

CHAP.

X.

The clergy had petitioned for a special absolution of their order. Convocation accordingly appeared before Pole at Lambeth on December 6, and the English clerical estate was formally purged of its guilt. For the reinstatement of their ancient tyrant the clergy of England had shown little anxiety. They consoled themselves, however, with the hope that with the restoration of Roman supremacy there would come compensation for the recent spoliation. The Lower House of Convocation expressed these aspirations in an address to the bishops. It prayed that the tithes and oblations lately alienated might be restored to the Church; that the modern anomaly of lay impropriations might be abolished; that the chantry revenues might be spent, as promised, in the establishment of schools and hospitals; that the Church, with respect to liberty, might be restored to the benefit of Magna Charta; that the burden of tenths, firstfruits, and subsidies might be removed; that the "Præmunire" statute (that fearful engine of tyranny) might at least be so explained by the judges that men should henceforth know what would be construed as an offence; that the "Statute of the Submission of the Clergy," and all others that limited the liberties of Convocation, might be repealed.

The clergy
are
absolved.

They plead
for restora-
tion of
Church
property.

It was a vain entreaty. That it was the duty of the chief pastor of the Church to insist on a redress of

But this is
not in the
bond.

CHAP.
X.

such grievances before absolving the country is obvious enough. But when had Rome sacrificed her own ambition to secure the national clergy their liberties? The recent concordat with respect to the Church property had been all of a piece with the jobberies under King John or Henry III., only now it was the oppression of an oligarchy, not a single tyrant, that obtained papal palliation. The Houses, of course, quoted the bull as confirming the lay impropiators in their tenure. The legate had blessed and he could not reverse it. Nothing could be done by the well-wishers of the Church, beyond inserting an appeal to conscience in the Act of Parliament which secured confiscated Church property to its present owners. The lay impropiators were herein implored, as they valued their own salvation, to make proper spiritual provision for the parishioners whose tithes they pocketed. Those who have in possession Church plate and ornaments are reminded of the fate of King Belshazzar. Such was the apostrophe of the helpless legate in the memorable Act¹ which riveted afresh the papal fetters. The preamble of this Act described the English Reformation as a declining from the unity of Christ's Church, attributable to the "false and erroneous doctrine . . . taught, preached, and written, partly by divers natural-born subjects of this realm, and partly . . . brought in hither from sundry foreign countries." The Act proceeds to repeal sixteen Acts and statutes which "had been made in Parliament since the twentieth year of Henry VIII., against the supremacy of the see Apostolic." As a sop to the injured clerical estate the Act restores the jurisdiction of all ecclesiastical ordinaries, and suspends the "Statute of Mortmain" for twenty

The Act.

Extends
clerical
liberties.

¹ 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. viii.

years. To obtain these concessions Convocation had formally waived its claim to the confiscated Church property, and this disclaimer is stated in the Act.

Pole's dispensation had extended to other innovations besides lay tenure of Church property. He had ceded (1) that all bishoprics, cathedral churches, hospitals, colleges, schools, etc., legally established since the schism, should be continued; (2) that marriages recently concluded, within the Roman degrees of consanguinity, affinity, and spiritual relation, should be confirmed and the issue declared legitimate; (3) that all institutions to benefices, and other promotions ecclesiastical, and all judicial processes made before ordinaries of the realm, should be ratified and confirmed.¹ These concessions were embodied in the Act. One more proviso remains to be noticed. The Lower House of Convocation had asked the bishops what was to be done with those who had preached heretical and seditious doctrines. The bishops had taken counsel in the matter, and were urged, it appears,² by the queen herself to revive the old penal laws against heretics. Parliament accordingly re-enacted the statutes which had been passed for the suppression of the Lollards under Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V. It did so without pressure, almost with unanimity. Little, however, could it have been anticipated by the bishops or the Parliament what an outbreak of cruelty was to result from this proceeding.

CHAP.
X.

But justifies lay impropriation. Pole's other concessions.

The laws for destruction of heretics revived.

¹ It is deserving of notice (in view of the allegations of modern Romanists) that the validity of the Anglican Orders conferred during the "schism" was not questioned by Pole. The bishops and priests who had been appointed with the ordinal of Edward VI. were recognized as Catholic bishops and priests. It was required that they should be reconciled to Rome, but not that they should be reordained. The Act of Restoration, by which Bishop Scory was enabled to continue in office, may be seen in Bonner's register. The denial of Ridley episcopal status in 1555 was merely a wanton insult.

² See Von Ranke, *History of England*, i. 209.

CHAP.

X.

Hitherto no
heretics
burnt.

The re-establishment of Romanism had hitherto been attended by few of those severities which, in the sixteenth century, were regarded as the proper means of checking heterodoxy. The extreme penalty had been inflicted on none since Joan Bocher and Von Paris suffered at the hands of the Edwardian Reformers. The revival of the ancient statutes at the close of 1554 inaugurated a policy of a very different kind, one which surpassed in heinousness anything that Romanism had yet sanctioned in this country. The cruelties of the Inquisition were now to be transplanted from Spain into England, and a reign of religious cruelty succeeded, rearing, in the words of a Romanist writer, such a "monument of infamy as even at the distance of three centuries cannot be regarded without horror."

The Marian
persecution
unintelligible.

The policy which prevailed during the four years 1555-58 appears now almost as unintelligible as atrocious. Nothing was to be gained by it. The re-establishment of the Pope was almost unopposed, and had it been otherwise the fires of Smithfield would be unlikely to kindle a spirit of Roman Catholic fervour. Its folly is testified by the result. It has given the honour of martyrdom to men who were many of them mere turbulent anarchists; it made a reign, in many respects excellent, more infamous to posterity than any in our history; and it established in our middle classes a deep-rooted hatred of "Popery," which is hardly yet extinct. The complete collapse of the Old Learning party, which in the next reign assumes the proportions and attitude of an impotent sect, was doubtless mainly due to the Marian policy of persecution. It may be granted that this reaction was unreasonable, since the extirpation of religious error by physical force was not a distinctive Romanist principle, but was preached and

It caused
the
Eliza-
bethan
reaction.

practised by the Protestant leaders whenever circumstances permitted, Calvin's claim to the title "bloody" being, indeed, not far inferior to that of Mary. If, however, the process of reasoning was wrong, the course of action it induced deserves our approval. The revulsion gave the sway to that sober party of Reformers whose guiding principles had been forsaken since the death of Henry. The minds that had been upset by the violent changes of the two preceding reigns gratefully welcomed rest in that quiet haven of Anglo-Catholicism to which the Elizabethan Reformers piloted them.

There is little doubt that these insane cruelties were suggested to the queen by the newly imported Spanish ecclesiastics. The fact that there was no persecution till Mary's marriage would itself suggest this view. The antecedents of the divines who then came into England for the express purpose, according to their biographers, of purging it from heresy, go far to confirm it. The tradition that Gardiner and the English bishops introduced this strange un-English policy originated apparently in the imagination of Foxe the martyrologist. It was developed by Burnet and historians of like mind, and at last appears in Hume, worked up into a fictitious argument between Gardiner and Pole as to the propriety of persecution. Gardiner is made to advise burning—Gardiner, who insisted on retiring from the commission of inquisitors, disgusted with the barbarities he had witnessed. Cardinal Pole, who did at last abet the persecution, despite his natural mildness, because impugned at Rome as a fautor of heresies, is represented as dissuading Gardiner. As a matter of fact, only two English bishops, besides Pole, can be branded with the disgrace of willingly abetting the policy of the court.

The blame rests with the Spanish ecclesiastics,

Not with the English bishops.

CHAP.
X.

Their names are Bonner, Bishop of London, a man notorious for coarse tastes and brutal temper; and Thornton, Bishop-suffragan of Dover, who owed his rise to Cromwell, and was one of the visitors employed to defame and despoil the monasteries. To withstand the Marian commissioners must have been perilous, yet six of the bishops appear to have kept the inquisitors out of their dioceses.

Account of
these eccle-
siastics.

The Spanish ecclesiastics were men who were familiarized with the carnage of heretics, on an extensive scale. One of them, Alphonso de Castro, Philip's chaplain, had written,¹ in 1547, a defence of the severities of the Inquisition, entitled "*De justa Hæreticorum punitione.*" The mission of another, Bartholomew Carranza, now Mary's chaplain, and the most active instrument of the new policy, is thus described by his Spanish biographer: "As it was the intention of the affianced parties to reduce the kingdom of England to the unity and bosom of the Catholic Church, the enterprise was begun by Carranza receiving orders to pass over into England, and to take with him great learned clerks, *who might arrange the business dexterously.*"² Among these clerks were Pedro de Soto and Juan de Villagarcia. The former was made Regius Professor of Theology at Oxford; the latter gave lectures at Lincoln and Magdalen Colleges. Their business in England, according to their biographer, was to "purify the universities . . . of the tares which the heretic doctors had sown in them,"³ *i.e.* to coun-

¹ And reissued it in 1556 and 1553, a fact which sufficiently impugns the sincerity of De Castro's sermon deprecating persecution in 1555.

² See three interesting essays in the *British Magazine* for 1839, 1840, on "Spanish Accounts of the Marian Persecution," where the view taken above is substantiated at length.

³ Fernandez, *Hist. Eccl.*, III. xxx. 433, quoted in the essay, *British Magazine*, May, 1840.

teract the recent teaching of Peter Martyr and the foreign Protestants. Among Spanish bigots there was but one way of effecting such purgation. The influence of these spiritual advisers on a queen who yearned for celebrity as a loyal daughter of the Church appears to account sufficiently for this dismal episode in our ecclesiastical history. It is, however, quite credible that Philip, who was continually presiding at holocausts of heretics in Spain, and who knew how bitterly the Reformers resented his sharing the English crown, himself instigated this policy. He thought fit, however, to work behind the scenes. De Castro, his chaplain, astonished England on one occasion by denouncing the persecutions from the pulpit. That this was intended as a blind can hardly be doubted when we recollect the avowed principles of the preacher.

Philip's
share in the
matter.

It must be remembered that there was also a strong party of lay statesmen panting for the destruction of the Reformers. In the Commons the hatred of the heretics had reached such a pitch, that we find Gardiner protesting against it. The most active instigator of persecution, next to the Spanish inquisitors, was the Marquis of Winchester, lord keeper in 1555. The turbulence and anarchy which were found to go hand in hand with anti-Roman teaching doubtless roused this savage feeling in the hearts of men who, if they cared not for religion, cared for their rights of property.¹

The
persecuting
gentry.

The imprisoned Reformers had demanded that they might be brought to trial without delay, declaring that

¹ Dean Hook well remarks: "The most liberal journals of the present day, conducted very often by men who never themselves cross the threshold of a church, could not be more violent in their reprobation of the bishops for not putting down Ritualism, than were the leading statesmen in Mary's reign, when with equal vehemence they were infuriated against Protestantism."

CHAP.

X.

The first
commis-
sion.
Jan. 1555.

for the changes of Edward's reign they could adduce authority from Scripture and the primitive Church. Their petition furnished Mary's advisers with a definite plan of action. On January 29 a commission was issued by Pole to Bishops Gardiner, Tonsal, Capon, and Aldridge to try persons suspected of heresy. The first to be examined were Hooper, the Puritan Bishop of Gloucester, and John Rogers, Prebendary of S. Paul's, editor of the work entitled "Matthew's Bible." In this and most succeeding trials, the doctrine of the transubstantiation of the Eucharist was made the touchstone. Both refused the materialistic dogma. They were thereupon condemned as heretics, degraded from the priesthood, and committed to the sheriff for execution. Rogers was burnt at Smithfield, Hooper at Gloucester. Dr. Rowland Taylor, parson of Hadleigh, in Suffolk, received the same sentence, and was burnt in his own parish. Saunders, a London clergyman, had meanwhile been burnt at Coventry. The dauntless Ferrar, of S. David's, suffered at Carmarthen on March 30.

Irritation
of the
populace.

For upsetting the recent religious settlement and again alienating the English nation from Rome, no more efficient policy could have been devised. It appears that the people were so moved that the commissioners did not dare go on with their work for some weeks. The Council had to write a circular letter to the bishops complaining that heretics were not proceeded against (May 24). Gardiner had already ceded his place on the commission to a man of very different temperament, Bonner of London. The savage nature of Bonner was incapable of compunction. He carried out the queen's policy, not merely ruthlessly, but with

needless brutality, and his diocese appears to have supplied nearly half the victims of the reign.¹

CHAP.
X.

To depict the barbarities inflicted in this period of persecution would be a painful task. We shall content ourselves with describing the memorable deaths of the three great Reforming prelates at Oxford. A year and a half had elapsed since Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer had been condemned in the schools. The authority of the commission which had sat on them was probably considered questionable. At any rate, in the autumn of 1555 their cases were made the subject of fresh investigations. Cranmer's case was different from that of Ridley and Latimer, inasmuch as he was a metropolitan, and could only be sentenced by the Pope. September 7 witnessed the formality of serving on the imprisoned primate a citation to appear at Rome within eighty days. Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester, was at the same time named as the Pope's commissioner to conduct an immediate trial at Oxford. Before Brooks Cranmer appeared on September 12. He denied the jurisdiction of a court presided over by a papal commissioner, and gave answer under protest. He was accused of having married after taking Orders, of holding heretical views on the Eucharist, of having rebelled against the Pope, to whom he had sworn

The three
bishops at
Oxford.

¹ The following details show the extent of the persecution and the number of the victims. In 1555 there were seventy-five executions; in 1556, eighty-three; in 1557, seventy-seven; in 1558, fifty-one. Of these two hundred and eighty-six victims, one hundred and twenty-eight were burnt in the diocese of London, fifty-five in that of Canterbury, and forty-six in that of Norwich. No more than seven persons were burnt in the diocese that ranks next in the catalogue, that of Oxford. And several dioceses less accessible to the Commissioners, or presided over by humane men, witnessed no executions, viz. Lincoln (White and Watson), Durham (Tonstal), Carlisle (Aldridge and Oglethorpe), Bath and Wells (Donne), Hereford (Warton), Worcester (Pate). Two hundred and forty of the sufferers were males. Besides those burnt, about sixty-eight persons are computed to have died in prison.

CHAP.

X.

allegiance, and of having advised the king to adopt the title "Supreme Head of the Church." With respect to the last charge, Cranmer's defence was that the title only meant that the king was head over all his subjects, whether lay or clerical. He was sent back to Bocardo prison to await the papal sentence.

Ridley and
Latimer
burnt.
Oct. 1555.

Meantime, Ridley and Latimer were brought up before the same kind of commission as had condemned Bishops Hooper and Ferrar. The commissioners were Bishops White of Lincoln, Brooks of Gloucester, and Holyman of Bristol, or any two of them. The accused were charged with the statements they had made at the former disputation. They refused to alter these statements, and were sentenced in S. Mary's Church to be degraded, excommunicated, and given over to the civil power. It is noticeable that they were only degraded from priest's orders. Latimer, it was pretended, ceased to be a bishop when he resigned his see in the reign of Henry VIII. Ridley's episcopal status was impugned because he had not been consecrated with the old formulary. The execution took place on October 6. Its scene was at a part of the city ditch nearly opposite Balliol. The tragic end of the sufferers at Oxford has raised them to the position of confessors of the English Church, and their claim to this honourable distinction is unassailable. If in criticising their actions we shall find much with which we cannot sympathize, we must remember that they were men who were gradually groping their way out of mediæval error, and who may be excused if they were sometimes driven by dread of the abuses of their time into extremes even more perilous. The same remark applies to Hooper, and the many other conscientious men who suffered at this time.

Nicholas Ridley came of an ancient Northumbrian family. He graduated at Pembroke, Cambridge, in 1522, and became a fellow, and in later days the master, of his college. He imbibed his theological opinions during travels on the Continent, where he became acquainted with many of the foreign Reformers. Becoming conspicuous for his erudition, he was appointed Cranmer's chaplain in 1537, and a royal chaplain in 1540. His opinions were far more pronounced than those of Cranmer or Henry, and did not have much scope for publicity till the accession of Edward. The iconoclasm which marked the first year of Edward's reign was encouraged by the violent preaching of Ridley. In this year he was made Bishop of Rochester, and when the bishops of the Old Learning were persecuted he was installed in Bonner's see of London (1550). He assisted Cranmer in the composition of the Homilies and Articles, and the compilation of the two Prayer-books, but to what extent is not known. He appears to have been a man of great learning, and it was at his persuasion that Cranmer in this reign forsook his Lutheran views with regard to the Eucharist, and advocated that doctrine of a spiritual Presence which had been maintained by John Scotus Erigena. Ridley unfortunately thought it necessary to illustrate this view by introducing a new piece of church furniture. In his dioceses he ordered the destruction of altars and the setting up of tables for Holy Communion. This innovation was afterwards sanctioned by law, but this does not excuse Ridley's arbitrary conduct, which was the more preposterous, inasmuch as the First Prayer-book was still the only lawful Liturgy. As Mr. Perry says, "This order not only produced the greatest confusion in the ritual of

CHAP.

X.

Career of
Ridley.

CHAP.

X.

the Church, as the table was set in every variety of position, but also was the fruitful parent of grievous sacrilege and profanation.”¹ When Tonsal was removed from Durham, Northumberland proposed to appoint Ridley to the see, reserving to himself a great part of the episcopal emoluments. It is not clear whether Ridley’s translation had been actually effected before the death of Edward. We have remarked that Ridley was needlessly aggressive in attempting to proselytize the Princess Mary during her confinement at Hunsdon. On Edward’s death he preached with his usual energy in favour of Lady Jane’s usurpation. When Mary triumphed he was committed to the Tower with Northumberland’s other adherents (July 26, 1553), and never again enjoyed liberty.

Career of
Latimer.

Hugh Latimer was a man of mark at the time of the divorce question, and was a generation older than his fellow-sufferer. He was the son of a small farmer. He had entered Christ College, Cambridge, and there learnt the principles of the New Learning from Thomas Bilney, a singular enthusiast who was afterwards burnt at Norwich. Latimer’s forte was preaching. His vigorous and homely style was much appreciated by Henry, and having thrown in his lot with the supporters of the divorce, he became Anne Boleyn’s chaplain, and was by her interest made Bishop of Worcester. His zealous denunciations of the abuses of the time probably did much good. Occasionally his zeal was not tempered by discretion. In March, 1532, he was summoned before Convocation, and compelled to admit that in his preaching he had committed himself to errors of doctrine. The offence was repeated shortly afterwards, and was again disowned. Probably

¹ Perry, *Student’s English Church History*, p. 206.

his zeal for reformation was without a substantial basis of fixed theological opinion. Yet, like most of the men of this time, Latimer saw no cruelty in punishing religious error as a crime, and he assisted at the burning of Friar Forrest for denying the king's supremacy. After the "Act of Six Articles" his position was in his opinion untenable. He resigned his bishopric (1539), and was committed to the custody of the Bishop of Chichester till the end of the reign. On Edward's accession he devoted himself to the work of preaching. Having no preferment, he could denounce the iniquities of Edward's Council in a style unknown to the courtly diocesans, and the vigour and humour of his homilies made him as hateful to the Government as he was popular with the public. The ground of his arrest in 1553 was "his seditious demeanour." Latimer had no pretence to theological attainment, and wisely shunned lengthy exposition of his tenets before the Oxford doctors. He said he had "forgotten his Latin," and would only give an account of his faith in English, and then they might "do their pleasure" with him. In the same bold style he conducted himself at his final trial in September, 1555. The glorious end of the old man is too well known to be described in detail.

Cranmer's death did not follow till March 21, 1556. In December the Pope's sentence had been issued, condemning him as having brought in "the heresy of Berengarius and the false and heretical doctrines of Luther." Thirleby of Ely and Bonner were the bishops appointed to degrade him from the archiepiscopal rank. This ceremony took place in Christ Church Cathedral. Cranmer contented himself with making a formal appeal from the Pope to the next General Council. In

Cranmer
reserved for
six months.

CHAP.

X.

He is induced to recant.

a plain layman's dress he was taken back to prison. Thirleby, a friend of Cranmer's, thinking to save him from the stake, implored him to make some concession to his adversaries in the way of recantation. In an unhappy moment of weakness the prisoner was induced to admit the Pope's authority in a paper commonly termed his first recantation. The way being thus paved, other recantations were wrung from him by the Spanish friars with regard to the Pope's supremacy, his own writings, and his views on the Sacrament of the Eucharist. With this last, his fourth recantation, came restoration to liberty, and the unhappy man had no doubt his life would be spared. A few more concessions were still required by the queen's divines. He must attest a paper denouncing the Protestant systems. Cranmer did so without reading it. More recantations were brought to him. These too he signed. Then he was ordered to appear in S. Mary's on March 21, to make his recantation public. It is sickening to read that the queen had throughout intended to sacrifice Cranmer. She had connived at the atrocious jobbery, by which a doomed man sold his convictions for a false assurance of pardon. The cause that Mary had for just resentment against the Primate makes the religious pretext in this case specially disgusting. In view of such wickedness, the inconsistency of Cranmer appears indeed a pardonable infirmity.

Renounces his recantations.

The unhappy man appears not to have learnt the purpose of his adversaries till he was on his way to S. Mary's Church. When called upon by the preacher, Dr. Cole, to declare his repentance, he declared that his recantations had been made with the view of saving life, and announced his allegiance to the form

of faith for which he had been condemned. The right hand that had signed those recantations should be the first member to suffer. A death comparatively easy ended the chequered life of the Reforming primate. His name has been brought in so often in connection with the history of the Reformation movement that it will be unnecessary to describe his career in detail. The day before Cranmer's execution, Cardinal Pole, the archbishop elect, received priest's orders in Grey Friars' Church. On March 21 he officiated as a priest, and on the 22nd he was raised to the episcopate. The Archbishop of York and six bishops of the southern province officiated.

CHAP.
X.

And is
burnt.
March 21,
1556.

Reverting to the proceedings of the previous year, we notice the most creditable transaction of Mary's reign, the restoration to the Church of the tenths, first-fruits, impropriations, manors, lands, etc., acquired by the Crown since the twentieth year of Henry VIII. The revenue of these, calculated at £60,000, was assigned to Pole for the improvement of the small livings. Parliament, the House of Commons especially, was reluctant to sanction this act of justice, fearing it might be followed by an order for the restitution of abbey lands and other spoils. Pole, however, gave satisfactory assurances on this point, and the Act legalizing this surrender was passed in October, 1555. On the accession of Elizabeth this commendable measure was rescinded. The abject poverty, ignorance, and social degradation of the parochial clergy in that and the following reign were a necessary consequence.

Mary
restored the
royal im-
propriations.

Elizabeth
cancelled
this act of
generosity.

Reginald Pole was consecrated as primate the day after Cranmer's death. The work of restoring religious houses was now actively carried on, and the records of the visitations of abbeys in Henry's reign, and similar

Re-es-
tab-
lishment of
unreformed
religion.

CHAP.

X.

damaging documents, were carefully sought for and destroyed. A house of Dominicans was established at Smithfield, a house of Carthusians at Sheen, and a nunnery near Brentford. The Knights of S. John were re-established, and the Jesuits tried to obtain a footing, but were unable to master the antagonism of Pole. Westminster, which in Henry's reign had been made a collegiate church, with a dean and canons, was restored to its ancient condition as a Benedictine abbey. The universities were visited, and care was taken to eliminate therefrom all heretical teaching. In imitation, perhaps, of Henry's absurd citation of Thomas Becket, a formal process was instituted at Cambridge against the deceased Reformers, Bucer and Fagius. They were convicted of heresy; and their bodies were disinterred and burnt with their books. At Oxford the body of Peter Martyr's wife, who had broken a vow of celibacy in marrying, was cast on a dunghill.

Persecution
continues.

It would have been well had the books and dead bodies of heretics been the only victims. Throughout the four years 1555-58 the Marian persecution was carried on with ever-increasing ferocity. At the close of the reign it was a settled thing that even recantation should not save the doomed heretic. He gained only the concession of being attended to the stake by a Romanist confessor. Cardinal Pole was induced to disobey the dictates of a naturally gentle temperament, and abet this policy of persecution, in order to recover his reputation as an orthodox Catholic. Pole was inclined to favour some of the Lutheran opinions; he had consequently been accused of heresy at Rome, and even cited by the Inquisition. The Pope readily listened to his detractors, since Pole had taken the side of Spain in the recent political complications, while the Apostolic

Pole forced
to head the
persecu-
tion.

see was abetting France. Mary supported him loyally, and when the Pope went so far as to revoke his legatine commission, and appoint in his stead Friar Peto, her own confessor, she showed a spirit worthy of her father. She wrote to the Pope, declaring that it was her prerogative to have a legate at Canterbury, and that neither she nor her nobility would have this ancient right impugned. The ports were closed to Roman vessels. Peto, who was abroad, was warned that he would incur a *præmunire* if he landed in England. Pole himself was not permitted to obey the insidious summons luring him into the power of his enemies at Rome. The defeat of the French at S. Quentin brought Paul IV. to a better mind. He admitted that the cardinal had been slandered. The appointment of Peto was not pressed, and Pole retained the title of legate, but whether by virtue of his office or as *legatus à latere* is not certain.

CHAP.
X.

The Pope's
attack on
Pole re-
sented by
Mary.

The petition of Convocation, in January, 1558, informs us what was still deemed lacking for the complete re-establishment of the old religion. In this petition (accompanying a subsidy for the disastrous wars in France) it is desired that Homilies, a Catechism, and an English Primer may be put forth; that churches, vestments, and altars may be reverently cared for and restored; that discipline may be established; that the clergy who had married in the late reign should only serve as unbeneficed curates; that the clerical dress should be enforced; and that more care should be expended on the cathedral schools and on the universities. Canons on these points were drawn up, but not passed.¹

Convoca-
tion in
1558.

Meanwhile there rankled in the heart of the nation a deep-seated abhorrence of the cruelties sanctioned by

Hatred of
Romanism.

¹ Cardwell's *Synodalia*, II. 448, 449.

CHAP.
X.

Mary. A revulsion from the religious system with which they originated was inevitable. Romanism had been given another fair trial. It had availed itself of it only to incur fresh odium by espousing a policy at which English humanity shuddered.

Henceforth England and Rome were to be severed. Schooled by its experiences under Edward and Mary, the Church of England was now able to bring out of its treasury things new and old, to reform without committing itself to the anarchical dreams of the sectary, to maintain the faith without reviving the superstition of the papist. Catholicism was still to be the religion of England, but not the centralizing Catholicism of Mary Tudor. Its Church would call itself Reformed, but not as recognizing the destructive systems of a Calvin or a Knox. But one life debarred the realization of such an ideal, and that life was now fast ebbing away, drained by corroding care, by blighted affection and disappointed hopes. On November 17, 1558, Queen Mary died, miserable and odious. Ere she had been twenty-two hours dead, Cardinal Pole, her cousin, primate, and most efficient ally, had passed away. A strange mortality was at this time rife, and within a few weeks no less than nine other sees were void of their occupants. The way was thus prepared for the continuance of reformation on the lines of Henry VIII.; this being the religious programme which now commended itself to the majority of thinking men, as well as to the new sovereign.

Death of
Mary and
many
bishops.

CHAPTER XI.

Elizabeth.

A.D. 1558-1575.

Modern misunderstanding of the religious status—Few “Papists”—And few “Protestants” in the modern sense—The Anglo-Catholics—Anglicanism and the Romanists—The Romanists leniently treated—Until Pius V. incited them to revolt—Anglicanism and the ultra-Protestants—Puritans humoured—But all Catholic essentials are conserved—Illustrations of this principle—The queen does not desire precipitate change—Conduct of Paul IV.—Consequent rupture—Turbulence of the “evangelics”—The royal proclamation—The coronation—Matthew Parker—Prayer-book revisionists appointed—The new Parliament—The supreme governorship—The “Spoilation Bills”—The *congéd'élire*—Convocation reactionary—The Elizabethan Prayer-book—The queen's influence apparent—The Ornaments rubric—“Act of Uniformity”—The queen and primate desire a higher standard—The Marian bishops—The disputation at Westminster—Punishment of two bishops—Nonjuring bishops deprived—Not treated with severity—The Court of High Commission—The visitation of dioceses—The “Injunctions”—The admonition about altars—And about wafer bread—Choice of a primate—Matthew Parker's consecration—The “Nag's Head Fable”—Other episcopal appointments—The Low Church element—The new Lectionary and Calendar—Scarcity of clergy—Lay helpers appointed—Jewel's “Apology”—The “Bishops' Bible”—Revision of Cranmer's Forty-two Articles—Opposed by the Puritans in Convocation—The queen alters the Articles—The disputed clauses accepted in 1571—The Second Book of Homilies—Nowell's Catechism rejected—The Puritan manifesto in Convocation—The queen's half-hearted support of the Church—Leicester's influence—Dissenters take Orders in the Church—Their divergence in ritual gives Parker a vantage-ground—The queen evades the responsibility—Parker's “Advertisements”—Not sanctioned by the queen—The “Advertisements” specify the minimum—Excerpts from the “Advertisements”—The “Advertisements” illustrated by Cecil's letter—Puritan protests—Non-conforming clergy cited—Romanist hostilities—The Thirty-nine Articles made a test of loyalty—Cartwright at Cambridge—Wentworth's “Bills of Reformation”—The “First and Second Admonition”—Tests applied to suspected clergymen—Death of Matthew Parker.

THE Church history of this period has often been misunderstood, because men have regarded the con-

CHAP.
XI.

Modern
misunder-
standing
of the
religious
status.

Few
"papists."

And few
"Protes-
tants"
in the
modern
sense.

The Anglo-
Catholics.

tending religious schools as separated by the hard and fast lines of a less unsettled time. The student reads that in 1554 a Protestant country became Romanist, and as unanimously became Protestant in 1559. Interpreting these phrases by the light of the present day, he is puzzled by what seems an extraordinary instance of national fickleness. One chief source of confusion lies in the application of the negative and sectarian term "Protestant" to a system professedly dogmatic and non-sectarian. In its modern sense—as including every kind of religious system except the Roman—this designation would not have been accepted by any of the Elizabethan Reformers. The term Romanist has also acquired a different force from what it had in the sixteenth century, inasmuch as it may include a belief in doctrines which the mediæval Church did not acknowledge, or at least did not enunciate. At the accession of Elizabeth, however, as in the three reigns preceding, these designations were not only of different force; they were really the badges of only two small sections of society. One national Catholic Church was recognized by all. The papists or Romanists were the faction, now small and unpopular, who insisted that the mediæval centralizing system was a Catholic essential. The "Precisian," on the other hand (whose congener on the Continent was called "Protestant" if a Lutheran, and "Reformed" if a Calvinist), not only regarded the Pope as Antichrist, but extended his hatred to various Catholic principles which our Church has, of course, always retained. Between these two poles lay the large party which we now call Anglican, or Anglo-Catholic—that which desired reformation but not revolution. Its uneducated adherents were probably repelled from Romanism by the Marian persecution alone, as

they had been from Protestantism by the misgovernment of Edward's reign. But it included also numbers of devout men who had learnt that the papal pretensions were not primitive but mediæval, and who found in the Papacy a source of many religious abuses. Unlike the Precisian party, these true Reformers saw no religious merit in disowning or denouncing the Pope. Rather, indeed, than tolerate such an outbreak of irreligion as had been witnessed under Edward VI., they would re-establish his power in England. Romanism, to many of them, doubtless appeared not so much a question of personal religion as of ecclesiastical policy. The re-establishment of Romanism, however, proved a failure. It failed because with Romanism came a system of religious persecution, hitherto unknown to this country and repugnant to the English disposition. Long before Mary's death it was clear that the Marian policy was unpopular with all but extreme partisans, and that Henry's expedient of a national Church reforming itself without deference to Rome must be tried again. Of this popular feeling Elizabeth was destined to be the exponent.

Elizabeth professed "Anglo-Catholic" views. But policy, selfishness, and personal attachments often prevented her, as they prevented her father, from governing in accordance with these principles. Her treatment of Church property affords an instance of this inconsistency. Fortunately it in no way affected the Church's more valuable heritage of Catholic doctrine. On this point the despoiling sovereign was more conservative than most of her prelates.

The Romanizing faction, represented by the Marian bishops, argued that the Church "had been planted within this realm by the motherly care of the Church

Anglicanism and the Romanists.

CHAP.
XI.

of Rome." The queen herself retorted on them with the undeniable fact that "when Austin came from Rome, this her realm had bishops and priests therein." So far from admitting that the centralizing ecclesiastical system was a Catholic essential, she asserted that her realm had been in past times usurped by a "wolf, whose inventions, heresies, and schisms be so numerous that the flock of Christ have fed on poisonous shrubs for want of wholesome pastures."¹ In dealing with this faction, however, Elizabeth showed no unnecessary intolerance. The Romanizing bishops promoted by Mary had, indeed, to resign their sees for disavowing the royal supremacy. But they were not confined in prisons like their predecessors under Edward VI., nor were they necessarily even in disgrace. Save when refractory, they were comfortably housed with the new diocesans. The severity with which certain Romanists were treated some ten years later, does not compel us to qualify this encomium. In the year 1569 an insurrection was hatched by the foreign seminarists. In 1570 Pius V. issued against Elizabeth a bull of deposition, and made Rome henceforth the centre of a political conspiracy. The massacre of the French Protestants on S. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, was openly approved of by this Pope. Jesuit missionaries were found in England preaching that it was a religious duty to assassinate Elizabeth. In the time of the Armada they openly advocated the Spanish cause. That such a dangerous form of political disaffection should have been checked by stringent laws, and that the offenders, when apprehended, received the usual barbarous penalty of high treason, need not surprise us.

The
Romanists
leniently
treated.

Until Pius
V. incited
them to
revolt.

Anglican-

For the other extreme of faction Elizabeth must have

¹ Strype, vol. i. pt. i. pp. 217, 218.

had naturally a deeper aversion. This feeling, however, motives of policy compelled her usually to curb. We have mentioned the flight of Reforming divines in Mary's reign, and their sojourn in the centres of foreign Protestantism. From these cities of refuge too many of the exiles returned with lowered views of Catholic doctrine and discipline. A formidable contingent was thus added to the noisy anti-Catholic faction. Elizabeth was a firm believer in the Apostolical succession and the Real Presence—doctrines which this faction denounced as the “dregs of popery.” Had her hands been free, the ultra-Protestant clique would probably have experienced scarcely more tender treatment under Elizabeth than under Henry VIII. Fortunately the queen was hampered by the uncompromising attitude of the Romanists, and could not afford to alienate both extremes. For the present the ultra-Protestants escaped. A deference was even shown to Puritan susceptibilities in the reformatory measures of the new reign, which won over the more sober minds in the faction. The Precisians, for the most part, remained in the Anglican communion: some, like Jewel and Horne, to ripen into zealous Churchmen; others, like Parkhurst and Sandys, to trouble our Israel with Puritan crotchets. Something was doubtless sacrificed in the way of suggestive ritual and venerable customs for the sake of such weak brethren. For these losses, however, compensation was made in the final reformatory measures of 1662. Meanwhile a schism was averted; tolerance was declared to be the rule of the Anglican Church; and the Reformers could boast that they had taken from Protestantism everything that was valuable, without damaging the catholicity of our Church. The ultra-Protestant faction experienced no

CHAP.
XL

ism and the
ultra-Pro-
testants.

Puritans
humoured.

CHAP.

XI.

But all
Catholic
essentials
are
conserved.

severities until its members waxed so violent and abusive as to disturb the peace of England.

Lest this compromise should be misinterpreted, we remind the student that Elizabeth's concessions to the ultra-Reformers were never of such a kind as to impair the catholicity of the Church, or effect a breach of continuity. The theory of the modern Dissenter is that our Church's existence begins at some hitherto undetermined date, when Government disestablished and disendowed a Roman Church, and set up a Reformed Church in its stead. The Church is thus artfully represented as a Protestant sect, differing from the other sects only in the enjoyment of peculiar patronage from the secular power. This fabrication has been as successfully crushed by the forceps of historical fact as such shadowy myths can be. With persons, however, to whom the gratification of sectarian animosity is more dear than truth, it still finds favour, as also with the ignorant and thoughtless. At the risk, therefore, of wearying the well-informed student we detail some of the incontestable facts.

Illustrations of this principle.

The Church of England under Elizabeth no more professed to be a different body from the Marian Church, than—to borrow an oft-cited metaphor—a man who has changed his clothes professes to have parted with his individuality. With few exceptions, the same laity worshipped under the two systems, the same clergy officiated. The exact number of Marian clergy who resigned on account of the religious changes under Elizabeth has been preserved. It included 189 only, out of a clerical force of 9400. These were the only clergy who thought that repudiating the Pope meant decatholicizing the Church. It was foreseen that enemies might bring against our Church this false

charge of a schismatic design. The greatest pains were therefore taken to show that there had been no breach of continuity, no new creation in the English ecclesiastical system. Matthew Parker, the new primate, was consecrated with the strictest regard to Catholic essentials. Lest there should be a shadow of doubt as to his being the legitimate successor of Wolsey, Cranmer, and Pole, no prelates officiated at his consecration, save such as had themselves been consecrated before the disorderly reign of Edward VI. As nothing was introduced into our Prayer-book that could degrade the Church to the level of the Protestant formations, so did the queen resent all attempts to treat her as a schismatic, although brought by political accident into alliance with the Protestant Powers. Pope Pius IV., after his offer to sanction the Prayer-book was refused, addressed the queen in the same terms as the Protestant princes in the invitation to the Council at Trent. An indignant remonstrance was returned, that "an invidious distinction is made between me and such other Catholic potentates as have been invited to this Council some time ago."

We resume the thread of our story. It was understood when Mary died, on November 17, that her successor was averse to papal supremacy, but the speed with which the rupture with Rome was effected was probably foreseen by no one. In the lengthy paper of agenda, drawn up by Elizabeth and Cecil on that very day, there is no allusion to religious changes. The Pope is to be informed of Elizabeth's accession, as well as the other friendly Powers. The only memorandum concerning religion is, "To consider the condition of the preacher of Paul's Cross, that no occasion be given by him to stir any dispute touching the

The queen
does not
desire pre-
cipitate
change.

CHAP.
XI.

Conduct of
Paul IV

Consequent
rupture.

governance of the realm." The old Offices continued to be used at the Eucharistic service, and remained authoritative for the next seven months. The royal chapel remained in the same state as in Mary's time, save that Elizabeth objected to the elevation of the host. Pope Paul IV., however, a foolish, hot-headed man, had heard of Elizabeth's Reforming tendencies, and chose to precipitate the rupture. He doubtless thought that a young queen with a disputed title would not be able to resist the pretensions of the Holy See. He wrote, it seems, an insolent letter, reminding Elizabeth that she had been declared illegitimate, and stating that her accession required his sanction, because England was "held in fee of the Apostolic see." England promptly disproved the insinuation by passing an Act which declared the queen to have supreme rule over all her subjects, and disallowed the pretensions of all foreign potentates. This insult from Rome necessarily prejudiced the positions of those persons whose consciences did not permit them to disavow papal supremacy. But to nothing else in the mediæval system besides this did Elizabeth show any hostility. In her Council she retained thirteen of her sister's advisers. The late queen and the cardinal were, of course, buried with the ancient Offices (December 10). At Mary's funeral, White, Bishop of Winchester, spoke violently against changes in religion. For this he was kept to his house for five weeks, then brought before the Council and admonished. It was found, however, now as in the preceding reign, that coercion was not so much needed for the Romanists as for the other extreme of faction. Many of the Puritans fondly imagined that the disorders of King Edward's reign were about to be restored.

The fugitive divines were clamouring for livings; the lay "evangelics" were beginning to tear down images and destroy relics. They were quickly undeceived. On December 28 there was issued a royal proclamation very like that which appeared on Queen Mary's accession. It stated that certain "who had formerly in times past the office of ministry in the Church" had convened assemblies and raised disputations, especially in London; "whereupon riseth among the common sort not only unfruitful dispute in matters of religion, but also contention, and occasion to break common quiet." The queen orders, therefore, that until the three estates of the realm be consulted with on the subject, there shall be no alteration in the established forms of worship, except that the English Litany, Lord's Prayer, and Creed may be permitted.

CHAP.
XI.

Turbulence
of the
"evange-
lics."
The royal
proclama-
tion.
Dec. 1558.

The coronation took place on January 15, with the mass and usual ceremonies. The bishops attended in their scarlet robes, all except Bonner, who (it is presumed) was in disgrace. Heath, the Archbishop of York, did not officiate, probably because he could not demur to Elizabeth's prejudice against the elevation of the host. His place was taken by Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, who agreed to meet the queen's wishes in respect to this accessory.

The
coronation.
Jan. 1559.

As Cardinal Pole's successor in the primacy, the queen and Cecil thought of Matthew Parker, Dean of Lincoln under Edward VI. Parker was learned, devout, and sufficiently removed from either pole of religious intolerance. He was averse to the restoration of mediæval doctrine in Mary's reign. He had therefore been deprived of his preferments. He had not, however, retired to the Continent, nor had he any sympathy with what he called the "Germanical natures"

Matthew
Parker.

CHAP.
 XI.

Prayer-
 book
 revisionists
 appointed.

of the self-exiled divines. His desire was, not to conform the Church to Luther's system or Calvin's system, but to reform by "imitating and following the example of the ancient and worthy Fathers." He held, in fact, the principles which found favour with such persons as Cecil, Bacon, Paget, Roger Ascham, and Elizabeth herself. Parker had lived quietly in Mary's reign, and had nothing to complain of beyond the loss of his preferments.¹ Early in 1559, Parker was summoned to London to confer with his friend Cecil on the course religious reform should take. What the queen and Cecil desired was a restoration of the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. To this proceeding Parker himself probably objected, on the ground that it would drive the "Germanical natures" entirely out of the English communion. The queen would have to contend against Romanist malcontents, including some of the most influential clergy; it would be imperatively necessary not to swell the numbers of the anti-Catholic faction. A revision of the Second Prayer-book suggested itself as a wiser expedient. This and other measures of ecclesiastical reform were put into the hands of a small committee, including not only Reformers of the old school, but also some of the Puritan party. The names of the committee were Parker, Pilkington, Hill, May, Cox, Grindal, Whitehead, and Sir Thomas Smith, who appears to have attended as representative of the Crown.²

¹ That he escaped thus easily suggests that the severities of the late reign have been exaggerated by such historians as Foxe and Burnet. For there is good reason to believe that Parker had gone the length of implicating himself in Northumberland's conspiracy in favour of Lady Jane. Yet he had lived through the years of the Marian persecution, not indeed in enjoyment of court favour like Ascham, or Dr. Wright, or Cecil—all of them men confessedly anxious for a religious Reformation—but "as a private individual" "happy before God," and finding in "delightful literary leisure greater and more solid enjoyments than my former busy and dangerous kind of life ever offered me."

² Besides conferring with Parker, Cecil meanwhile had circulated questions

Parliament opened on January 25. Sir Nicholas Bacon was the interpreter of the royal intentions. On the one hand, nothing was to "be advised or done which . . . were likely to breed or nourish any kind of idolatry or superstition, . . . so, on the other side, heed is to be taken that by no licentious or loose handling any manner of occasion be given to any contempt or irreverent behaviour towards God or godly things."¹ The relative positions of the Church and the throne had to be determined before ecclesiastical legislation could be entered on. Theoretically, at least, Elizabeth's claims in this regard were only what an overwhelming majority of English Catholics had for centuries acknowledged. Disowning as impious Henry's new-coined title "Head of the Church," the queen challenged no other authority than that which "was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of the realm, that is, under God to have sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons."² The title adopted by Elizabeth was "supreme governor." Thus limited, the principle of the royal supremacy would have certainly been accepted by most Catholics of the præ-Reformation period. The leading ecclesiastics, however, were now fairly committed to a papal—as distinct from a

CHAP.
XI.

The new
Parlia-
ment.
Jan. 1559.

The
supreme
governor-
ship.

among men of all parties as to the ecclesiastical policy to be adopted. The answers were, of course, of varying complexion. One of them deserves attention as illustrating the difficulties of the situation. From this "device offered to Secretary Cecil" we learn that it was daily expected that the Pope would excommunicate Elizabeth and invite the Roman Catholic sovereigns to a crusade. The claims of Mary Stuart might be supported by France, Scotland, and Ireland. Among men of the "papist sect" this opposition might find supporters. Such was one danger to be apprehended. On the other hand, another and greater danger lay in the bigotry of the Puritans. There were some who, when they saw many of the old ceremonies retained and the doctrines of the foreign Protestants disallowed, "would call the alteration a cloaked papistry or a mingle-mangle." The device continues, "It is better that they should suffer than that her highness or the commonwealth should shake or be in danger."

¹ D'Ewes, Journals of Q. Eliz. Parliam., p. 12.

² Eliz. Injunctions, vi.

CHAP.
XI.

Catholic—cause. Powerful speeches were made by Archbishop Heath and Bishop Scott against the Supremacy Act. This Act became law on April 29. In view of the probable disloyalty of the opponent faction, it required all clergymen, magistrates, and officers to take an oath acknowledging the queen's supremacy.

The
"Spolia-
tion Bills."

The deplorable financial condition of England is the only excuse that can be made for the "Spoliation Bills," which passed on March 2 and April 6. By one of these the firstfruits and tenths of ecclesiastical benefices were again attached to the Crown. By the other the queen was empowered, on the avoidance of a see, to take what manors she should choose, giving in exchange impropriate tithes. This revival of the policy of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. was not only bravely resisted by the lords spiritual, but opposed by a large minority in the Commons. Some ten sees were at this time vacant. The timely windfall more than replenished the exhausted exchequer; the excess was spent in subsidizing court favourites. A great impoverishment of the Church was the necessary consequence. In exchange for lands and manors the diocesans received ill-paid tenths and the dilapidated parsonages formerly belonging to the monasteries. The iniquity of the transaction was boldly depicted by Dr. Cox, Bishop-elect of Ely, in two letters to the queen.¹

The *congé
d'élire*.

In her exposition of the supremacy the queen had echoed, not the opinions of Henry VIII. or her brother's Erastian Council, but those maintained by the patriot statesmen of old times. Similarly, she disowned the unconstitutional practice obtaining in those two reigns of appointing bishops by letters patent from the Crown. The *congé d'élire* was re-established, subject to the same

¹ The letters may be found in Strype, Annals, i. pt. i. pp. 144, sqq.

rule as had obtained before the reign of Henry VIII., that the Crown directed the choice of the chapter by nominating a candidate or candidates. This arrangement subsists at the present time. The difference between a Government appointment so qualified and one in which the Church has no voice will appear fanciful only to the unreflecting. Had "letters patent" become part of the Anglican system, the Church could claim no redress should an unorthodox or even unordained person be appointed to a bishopric. As it is, the appointment of a bishop suspected of heterodoxy is a legitimate grievance; the appointment of a layman, common enough in Germany, would here be impossible.

The progress of Reformatory measures was satisfactory to Parker, Scory, and other dignitaries; but the Marian bishops had gained the suffrages of the Lower House of Convocation, and for a time it appeared as if a large proportion of the clergy was hopelessly alienated from the cause of reformation. The experiences of the clerical body under Edward sufficiently justified a strong prejudice against anti-papal policy. It is not surprising to find that at a time when "Spoilation Bills" were in progress, Convocation pronounced in favour of papal supremacy and the dogma of transubstantiation. These principles certainly had no hold on the bulk of the clergy, but were deemed preferable to royal aggression and "sacramentarian" profanity, seemingly the only possible alternatives. The prejudice against royal supremacy was shaken by Elizabeth's persistent disclaimer of all desire to obtrude on spiritual prerogative; the sovereign's example in her own chapel showed that belief in the Real Presence did not require to be bolstered up by the materialistic dogma of Paschasius Radbertus. The clergy were satisfied. The

Convoca-
tion re-
actionary.

CHAP.

XI.

sacrificial efficacy of the Eucharist remained, as it is still, a moot question in the Anglican communion. The majority of those who became bishops did not accept it; those, however, of the clergy who continued to teach it were not regarded as acting in defiance of the revised Prayer-book, much less was any endeavour made to oust them from their preferments. The main ground of difference between Anglican and Romanist was henceforth to be papal supremacy. If a clergyman disowned the mediæval theory of Roman prerogative by taking the prescribed oath, his view of the Eucharist would certainly not bring him into trouble; in some cases even non-acceptance of the revised Prayer-book doubtless passed unnoticed. It was not till 1571 that attempt was made to enforce a closer conformity of doctrine.

The Elizabethan
Prayer-book.
A.D. 1559.

Meanwhile much was done which might well be regarded as an infringement on the liberties of the Church. The committee appointed by the queen had to effect the revision of the Prayer-book without the sanction of Convocation. The new edition, moreover, did not reach that level to which Elizabeth had hoped to raise Edward's Second Prayer-book, and which it might have been expected to attain under the auspices of such a divine as Parker. The defect must be accounted for by Parker's illness and his nomination of Dr. Guest, a divine of Puritan proclivities, to take his place on the committee. Cecil communicated to the committee the queen's wish that crucifixes, processions, prayers for the dead, and reception of the consecrated elements in the mouth should be sanctioned. She also desired that the celebrant should have a distinctive dress, and that non-communicants should attend at the performance of the Church's great act of worship.

While this was the mind of the queen, four at least of the commissioners—Whitehead, Grindal, Pilkington, and Guest—were bent on making large concessions to the Puritan party. The course of the negotiations is not easily traced, but it can scarcely be doubted that the prescription as to “Ornaments” emanated from the Queen herself. Henceforth the minister was to use “at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministration, . . . such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.” This direction was accepted as a rubric at the revision of the Prayer-book in 1662. It was doubtless by the same authority that the “Black Rubric” of Edward’s Second Prayer-book, which apologizes for the act of kneeling at Holy Communion, was struck out.¹ Seldom has the Church had such reason for condoning royal interference in matters spiritual. The “Act of Uniformity” which sanctioned the new Prayer-book pretended that it was all but identical with the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI. It makes a most cursory mention of the alterations, and says nothing about the omission of the “Black Rubric.” It may be, as Mr. Perry supposes,² that the queen manipulated the new formulary after the “Act of Uniformity” had been passed. Doubtless, however, Parliament, conscious of the irregularity of publishing a Prayer-book without the sanction of Convocation, was desirous that it should pass as the authorized Prayer-book of 1552 revived. Perhaps this tendency to minimize the difference between the two books will sufficiently account for the Act’s silence on the subject of the “Black Rubric.” In The “Orna-

The queen's
influence
apparent.

¹ This was reinserted in a modified form in 1662.

² Perry, *Student's English Church History*, p. 261.

CHAP.

XI.

ments
Rubric."

the Act the Ornaments prescription takes this form: "such ornaments of the Church and of the minister thereof shall be *retained* and be in use as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., *until further order shall be therein taken* by authority of the queen's majesty."¹ No further order was taken. That one party in the Church obeyed the prescription, and wore what contemporary Puritans called "the execrable garments of the ungodly mass priests," has been, we think, sufficiently proven.² An antagonistic and increasing faction hated even the surplice. To press the rubric on these persons would have been impolitic. That minimum of ornament which was enforced by Parker's "Advertisements" of 1566 was at last seldom exceeded. Copes, if not other vestments, were worn in the cathedrals and in the royal chapels. The parish churches did not aspire above the surplice.

"Act of
Uniform-
ity."
April 28,
1559.

The "Act of Uniformity" enforced the use of the new Prayer-book on and after June 24, under penalties similar to those of the Act of 1549. But there is no reason to believe that this statute was pressed as the "Act of Supremacy" was. The object of the queen was to

¹ It has been contended that this clause has in view a future *curtailing* of ritual. Judged, however, by the context and by contemporary criticisms, it appears to mean that the queen hoped to *add* to the prescriptions on the subject. The Act continues thus: "And also that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church, by the misusing of the orders appointed in this book, the queen's majesty may by the like advice . . . ordain and publish such *further ceremonies or rites* as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments." The Puritan George Withers certainly regarded the clause about "further order" as dangerous to his party. He laments not only that the ancient ceremonies were "restored under the same name," but "that power moreover, was given to the queen and the archbishop to introduce whatever additional ceremonies they might think proper." He regards the admonition substituting round wafers for the common bread of Edward's reign as issued with this warrant. (See Zurich Letters, 2nd Series, pp. 150, 161.)

² See Maccoll, *Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism*, p. 66 and seqq., and Prefaces to second and third editions.

humour religious scruple so long as it did not involve acknowledgment of the Pope. That neither she nor Parker were quite satisfied with the low standard of the Elizabethan Prayer-book must indeed have been notorious. The altar in her private chapel, with its crucifix and lighted candles, showed the queen's proclivities. Parker's were expressed by his conduct when called upon to provide a Latin Prayer-book for the college chapels in Oxford, Cambridge, Eton, and Winchester. Instead of translating the new Prayer-book into Latin, he provided a Latin translation of the Prayer-book of 1549. This Latin form of the Prayer-book was even commended to the notice of the parochial clergy, who were authorized to take the daily Offices of matins and evensong from this formulary when there was no congregation present. From Parker, too, the universities received a formulary to be used "in commendationibus benefactorum." Here that communion between the Church militant and the saints departed which the new Prayer-book had ignored was expressed with sufficient plainness. By such proceedings those who had dreaded that "reformation" now, as in Edward's time, meant "de-catholicizing," were reconciled to Elizabeth's *régime*.¹

The number of clergy who were deprived for refusing the oath of supremacy, or for demurring to the English Offices, amounted in all to only 189 out of 9400. This number included, however, no less than fourteen bishops.² The episcopal representatives of the Old Learning had almost to a man thrown in their lot with "popery."

CHAP.
XI.

The queen
and pri-
mate desire
a higher
standard.

The Marian
bishops.

¹ Or in the phraseology of Neal, the Puritan historian, "by this method most of the *popish* laity were deceived into conformity." The "popish laity" are, of course, those who would not have tolerated the substitution of a sect for a Catholic Church. Mr. Soames points out that these deluded persons amounted to about two-thirds of the entire population.

² The bishops were followed by eighty rectors, fifty prebendaries, fifteen masters of colleges, twelve archdeacons, twelve deans, six abbots.

CHAP.
XL.

They had completely misread Elizabeth's character, and presumed that she would not dare to act in defiance of the Holy See. They were convinced that renunciation of the Pope would bring on a revolution. In this case they would side with Philip or Mary Stuart, or any other pretender whose cause the Pope should sanction. De Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, a subtle Spanish ecclesiastic, had been sent as ambassador to England for the express purpose of encouraging these anticipations.¹

The dis-
putation at
West-
minster.

So strongly had the Lower House of Convocation protested against Elizabeth's invasion of the rights of the spirituality, that it was deemed advisable to give the Romanist partisans the privilege of defending their cause in a public disputation. Eight divines were selected from each side to argue in Westminster Abbey on the following questions:—(1) Whether it is against the Word of God and the custom of the ancient Church to officiate and administer the sacraments in a language unknown to the people. (2) Whether every Church has authority to appoint, change, or set aside ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, provided the same be done to edifying. (3) Whether it can be proved in the Word of God that there is offered in the mass a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. For the Romanists appeared Bishops White, Bayne, Scott, and Watson, with Cole, Harpsfield, Langdale, and Chadsey. The Reformers were represented by Bishop Scory, with Cox, Horne, Aylmer, Whitehead, Grindal, Guest, and Jewel. The Romanists had agreed that they should speak first, and the Reformers reply. On the second morning of the debate they objected to this arrangement, as giving a palpable advantage to their antagonists. An angry discussion succeeded, in which White and Watson made

¹ Froude, *History of England*, vol. vi. p. 206.

themselves particularly offensive. In vain did the new lord keeper, Bacon, who presided, and Archbishop Heath who acted as Bacon's assessor, urge the Romanist champions to speak to the question. The lord keeper, forced to dissolve the meeting, remarked, "For that ye would not that we should hear you, perhaps you may shortly hear of us." The threat was fulfilled. White and Watson were committed to the Tower for contempt; the other Romanist champions were confined for a time to the boundaries of London and Westminster, and had to report themselves daily to the Council. These severities are intelligible when we find that for the sake of this barren controversy the business of both Houses of Parliament had been suspended. After the passing of the "Act of Supremacy" it was plain that the malcontent prelates must submit, or suffer deprivation. On May 15 Archbishop Heath, with thirteen nonjuring bishops and other divines, were summoned before the queen in council. To the queen's remonstrances Heath replied by recalling "her gracious sister's zeal unto the holy see of S. Peter's at Rome," and urging that a contrary policy would bring on the realm "perpetual ignominy and curse."¹ The queen, however, denied that Mary's conduct necessarily affected her own policy. "It is," she said, "by diving into and following the proceedings which have come down to me from a long line of predecessors that I mean to rule, and I hope that in this my successor will follow my example. To no power whatever is my crown subject, save to that of Christ, the King of kings." The bishops were silenced. Kitchin of Llandaff consented to take the oath of supremacy. The others were deprived, but experienced a leniency which contrasts favourably with the treat-

CHAP.
XI.

April 3,
1559.

Punish-
ment of two
bishops.

Nonjuring
bishops
deprived.

¹ See Strype, i. pt. i. p. 207.

CHAP.

XL.

Not treated
with
severity.

ment of "expulsed" bishops in the two preceding reigns. Heath lived at his own house near Windsor, and was often visited by the queen. The usual plan, however, was to house a nonjuring with a conforming bishop, the host being made responsible for his guest's continuance in England. Commonly this strange alliance ended in friendship and mutual respect. Bonner, however, the most unfavourable specimen of the Marian episcopate, soon quarrelled with his custodian, the Bishop of Lincoln. He was therefore compelled to occupy a house within the rule or radius of the Marshalsea prison. Watson was found preaching treason, and was imprisoned for the rest of his life in Wisbech Castle.

The Court
of High
Com-
mission.

Before the issue of this conflict with the Romanizing bishops was reached, Elizabeth had armed herself with a formidable weapon by securing parliamentary sanction for the Court of High Commission. Nothing but the queen's own religious principles prevented this new court from being employed in such a way as to sap the foundations of the Church. Its encroachments on the other courts in the reigns following, and their connection with the overthrow of Charles I., are known to every student of English history. The exceptional state of ecclesiastical affairs in the year 1559 was the only apology for its institution, and when the crisis had passed the extraordinary power delegated to the Crown ought to have been cancelled. The legal sanction for this court was a clause in the "Act of Supremacy," which authorized the queen and her successors to appoint a commission "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, which, by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction, can or may

lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, or amended." Nothing, however, was to be adjudged heresy which had not been of old so adjudged in provincial synods or General Councils, or should be so determined by Parliament with the assent of Convocation.

CHAP.
XL.

Under this sanction a body of commissioners visited the dioceses this summer. The leading commissioners were Matthew Parker, Edmund Grindal, Thomas Smith, Walter Haddon, Thomas Sackford, Richard Goodrick, and Gilbert Gerrard. One of these six was to be present at each visitation. They were charged to suspend immoral clergymen, to restore such as had been illegally displaced, to allow pensions to those who refused the oath of supremacy, to report on the true state of churches, and to distribute everywhere a body of "Injunctions," compiled probably by the Prayer-book commission.¹ We have already observed that few clergymen were deprived, and that it was the queen's intention that all should be done in a concessory spirit. The intolerance, however, of some of the commissioners far exceeded their instructions, and in certain districts they sanctioned most unjustifiable outrages on what they considered "superstitious ornaments." The churches in London particularly suffered. The rood and high altar at S. Paul's were desecrated; "the rood and Mary and John" at S. Magnus, Fish Street, and at S. Botolph, Billingsgate, were burnt. Churchyard crosses were in some places pulled down.²

The visitation of dioceses.

The first twenty-eight of the "Injunctions" were

The "Injunctions."

¹ So Strype and Cardwell. Dean Hook remarks, however, that "it is more than doubtful" whether the commission "as a body would have given their assent to all the 'Injunctions.' We may with more confidence attribute them to Parker and Cecil: the latter, we know, revised them."—Archbishops, "Matthew Parker," p. 226.

² See Strype, *Annals*, I. pt. i. p. 254.

CHAP.

XI.

based on those published by Edward's Council in 1547.

The following prescriptions may be noticed:—

II. The clergy are charged not to "set forth or extol the dignity of any images, relics, or miracles." (In Edward's "Injunctions" the destruction of images and relics is ordered.) III. The clergy are to preach one sermon in every month, exhorting their hearers to works of mercy and charity, and not to such works "devised by men's fantasies" as pilgrimages, setting up candles, praying on beads, etc. VI. An English Bible and the Paraphrase of Erasmus to be set up in the churches. X. Registers of baptisms, marriages, and burials to be kept in the churches. XVIII. Processions in church or churchyard forbidden, as engendering contention and strife, "by reason of fond courtesy and challenging of places in the procession." XXII. It shall be taught that no man ought "obstinately and maliciously to break and violate the laudable ceremonies of the Church." (The "Injunction" of 1547 had also protested against superstitious abuse of ceremonies: this protest is left out.) XXIII. "Monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition," such as "shrines . . . tables, candlesticks, trindals, rolls of wax, pictures, paintings," are to be destroyed. XXVII. One of the Homilies to be read every Sunday. XXIX.¹ Offence having been given by "lack of discreet behaviour in many² ministers . . . both in choosing of their wives and indiscreet living with them," no priest or deacon shall hereafter marry without the consent of the bishop and two neighbouring justices, nor without the good will of the bride's parents or guardians. Masters, deans, and heads of colleges are not to marry without permission from the visitor. XLIV. Clergy are to instruct the young for at least half an hour before evening prayer every holiday and every other Sunday, in the Commandments, Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Catechism. XLVII. The churchwardens are to give the visitors an inventory of copes and other

¹ "Injunctions" XXIX.-LIII. have no counterpart in Edward's "Injunctions," with the exception of XXXIX., the "Injunction" requiring the exclusive use of King Henry's Latin grammar.

² This, of course, is merely a testimony to Elizabeth's well-known aversion to clerical marriages. The statute on the subject was still that of 1552, which (presumably by some oversight) had not been repealed in the reign of Mary.

ornaments, "vestments, plate, and books, and specially of grails, couchers, legends, processional, etc."¹ L. People are to live in charity, and not use "convicious words," as "papist or papistical heretic, schismatic, or sacramentary." LI. To stop the spread of "unfruitful, vain, and infamous books and papers," no books are to be published without the imprimatur of the ordinary, and the bishop or archbishop or chancellor of the university. LII. The people are to kneel in time of the Litany and all other prayers, and whensoever the name of Jesus is pronounced "due reverence" is to "be made of all persons, young and old."

CHAP.

 XI.

In an admonition attached to the "Injunctions" directions are given for the placing of altars. It will be remembered that the Act of Edward VI. had aimed at transforming the altars into tables. This Act was now law, since all the religious legislation of Mary had been repealed. The Puritan faction were clamouring for more desecrations. They addressed a petition against altars to the queen. Her Majesty is informed that the "greatest learned men of the world, as Bucer, Ecclampadius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Calvin, etc., etc. . . . have in their reformed churches . . . always taken away the altars; only Luther and his churches have retained them." In the directions attached to the "Injunctions" we detect the diplomatic skill of Elizabeth. To openly pronounce in favour of altars was impossible in the present position of parties. But a modification could be devised such as would protect the ancient use, save only in parishes where the incumbent and churchwardens were Puritans. To these functionaries was now committed the settlement of the burning question. If they did remove an altar, they were to do

The admonition
about
altars.

¹ This doubtless means that the Church ornaments and devotional literature were to be inspected by the visitors, and not left to the mercies of ultra-Protestants, as in 1547-8. The Roman Offices were, of course, removed. But the "Injunction" is no more to the disparagement of the copes and other vestments than of the Church plate.

CHAP.

XI.

And about
wafer
bread.

Choice of
a primate.

so without "riot or disorder." And they were to provide "that the table be decently made, and set in the place *where the altar stood*; and so to stand but when the Communion should be celebrated. And then it shall be so placed within the chancel as the minister may more conveniently be heard of the communicants, and the communicants in more conveniency and number communicate with the minister."¹ The order for the bread also shows us the direction of her Majesty's sympathies. "For the giving the more reverence to the holy mysteries," such "common fine bread" as was used for sacramental bread under Edward VI. is disallowed. The bread is to be "of the same fineness and round fashion, but somewhat bigger, as was the usual bread or wafer heretofore named singing cakes, which served for the use of the private mass." But it is to be "plain, without any figure impressed upon it."

We must now direct the student's attention to the new episcopal appointments. Parker's retiring disposition had led him to decline the primacy when Bacon first communicated with him on the subject. The queen's choice had next fallen on Sir Nicholas Wotton, Dean of Canterbury under Mary. Wotton, like Cardinal Pole, was a Catholic with Reforming proclivities. He was conspicuous rather as a diplomatist than a divine, and had been in the Privy Council under Edward and Mary. That he declined the offer is probably to be set down to his consciousness of a lack of theological attainments. That the offer was made will convince the reader that the hard and fast line of doctrinal severance which in later times distinguished papist from Anglican was at this date unknown. The queen's next choice is no less instructive. Feckenham,

¹ See Cardwell, *Annals*, vol. i. p. 201.

Abbot of Westminster, had been chaplain to the Bishop of London, the "Bloody Bonner" of Foxe. He was, however, of mild and tolerant disposition, and the queen probably thought he would be a fit exponent of her own conciliatory policy. Feckenham, however, felt himself unable to renounce the papal supremacy.¹

Matthew Parker was again pressed, and the matter was decided before the middle of May. The *cong   d'  lire* was issued on May 18, accompanied probably by a letter missive nominating Dr. Parker. He was elected by the dean and chapter on August 1.

In the first commission for his consecration three of the malcontent bishops were included—Tonstal, Bourne, and Poole. They refused to act. A second commission was issued, to seven bishops of Reforming principles. Three are sufficient, according to Catholic usage, to give canonical consecration. A state enactment of Henry's reign² required four, when the metropolitan was not one of the officiating bishops. The warrant therefore required that "at least four" of the seven should officiate. The four whom the archbishop-elect deputed to this business were all of them men who had been raised to the episcopate in the reign of Henry. Their names were Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, and now elect of Chichester; Hodgkins, Bishop-suffragan of Bedford; Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter; and Scory, formerly Bishop

Matthew
Parker's
consecra-
tion.

¹ See Wood's *Athenæ*, i. 500. Hook remarks that "it is so unlikely the Puritans would have tolerated such an archbishop that we should probably be correct in saying that he was only 'talked of for the primacy.'" The subsequent career of the last Abbot of Westminster was unfortunate. Having refused the oath of supremacy, he was housed with Horne, Bishop of Winchester, with the usual restrictions on his liberty. Being unable to live peacefully with this somewhat narrow-minded prelate, he was transferred to the custody of the Bishop of London. In the disturbances stirred up by the emissaries of Pius V. he fell under suspicion, and was confined in Wisbech Castle.

² Stat. 25 Henry VIII. cap. 20.

CHAP.

XI.

The "Nag's
Head
Fable."

Other
episcopal
appoint-
ments,

of Rochester, and now elect of Hereford. That all four were canonically consecrated is admitted by all honest Romanist historians. The consecration of Dr. Parker took place in the chapel at Lambeth on December 17, 1559. The formulary used was the second ordinal of Edward VI., which had been legalized by the recent "Act of Uniformity." The ceremony is described in detail in contemporaneous accounts surviving in the Lambeth register and the manuscripts of Corpus Christi, Cambridge. In 1603, when the hostility of Romanist and Anglican reached its acme of bitterness, one Christopher Holywood circulated a clumsy fiction, intended to make men believe that the proceedings on this occasion were informal and irreverent. The story is known as the "Nag's Head Fable." It pretends that Scory assembled Parker and all the other newly elected bishops at a tavern in Fleet Street, and there made them members of the episcopate by laying a Bible on their heads. The tale, though proved false by Lord Nottingham, an eye-witness of the consecration in Lambeth Chapel, was eagerly accepted in certain quarters as the only means of assailing the validity of Anglican Orders and the catholicity of our Church. It will suffice to say that it has been given up as a clumsy falsehood by such writers as Lingard, Tierney, and Charles Butler, and only deserves attention as showing to what shifts the assailants of our Church have been driven.¹ Returning to matters of fact, we notice that no new bishops were consecrated on the same day as Parker. A few days after his own consecration, however, Parker assisted at the consecration of Grindal, Bishop of London; Cox, Bishop of

¹ A good *résumé* of the arguments by which this myth is unmasked may be found in Perry's *Student's English Church History*, p. 283.

Ely; Sandys, Bishop of Worcester; and Merrick, Bishop of Bangor. In January five more were consecrated—Young to S. David's, Bullingham to Lincoln, Jewel to Salisbury, Davis to S. Asaph, and Guest to Rochester.

The stratagem of disarming a possible leader of faction by promotion to office sometimes receives illustration in our own times. It was to this principle of policy that many of the Elizabethan bishops owed their preferment. Puritanism of a mild type found its way to the Episcopāl bench: it soon had its representatives in the Lower House of Convocation. It was only by the firmness of the primate and the queen that this party was kept in restraint. Great at first were the lamentations of Sandys and the other commissioners who had destroyed roods and images, at having to officiate in the queen's chapel at an altar bedecked with lights and crucifix, clad in "popish vestments."¹ The queen replied with an unfeeling threat to restore all the roods to parish churches. In view of such a fearful prospect the aggrieved bishops thought it better to hold their peace.

On January 22, 1560, a commission was issued to Parker, Grindal, Bill, and Haddon, to provide a Lectionary, or Table of Lessons. For this work Parker was already paving the way by a revision of the Calendar. The number of holy days before the Reformation had been excessive, and it was generally felt that their observance fostered idleness rather than piety. The Edwardian Reformers had effected a somewhat precipitate expurgation of the Calendar. The Calendar of 1549 retained only what are called red-letter days—those for which Collects, Epistles, and Gospels are appointed. Among these was included S. Mary Mag-

The New
Lectionary
and
Calendar
A.D. 1561.

¹ See the Zurich Letters, i. 63, 66, 67.

CHAP.

XI

dalene's Day. In 1552 S. George, S. Lawrence, and S. Clement were added as black-letter days to the Calendar, and (perhaps by mistake) the name of S. Mary Magdalene was altogether omitted. In Parker's Calendar, which was published in 1561 by the authority of the commissioners, the red-letter days remained the same as in 1552; a few black-letter days were, however, allotted to each month. Amongst these appears S. Mary Magdalene's Day. Very little alteration was made in this Calendar at the revision of 1662. The Lectionary of 1561 has also remained almost unaltered till the present reign. It is noticeable that the admonition which precedes the "Second Book of Homilies," appears to give the clergyman licence to substitute another lesson at his own discretion when the appointed passage is considered unedifying.¹ These two publications had no synodical sanction. Discussion on the matter of the Calendar would probably have raised a storm among the Puritans. Parker avoided the danger by stretching his own authority as primate, and the powers of the newly devised ecclesiastical commission. His action is excusable, but it established a dangerous precedent.

Scarcity of
clergy.

The plague which had proved so fatal to the bishops had thinned the ranks of the clergy. The diocesans found it no easy matter to fill the impoverished livings with men of learning and social status. Some of the new bishops thought that in such an emergency these qualifications might be disregarded, and did not scruple to confer Holy Orders on mechanics or "artificers" of godly life. Archbishop Parker writes in August, 1560, to Grindal, complaining of this degradation of the holy office. "Now," he says, "by experience it is seen that

¹ See Cardwell, *Annals*, i. p. 261, note.

such manner of men, partly by reason of their former profane arts, partly by their light behaviour otherwise and trade of life, are very offensive unto the people: yea, and to the wise of this realm are thought to do great deal more hurt than good, the Gospel there sustaining slander.”¹ The archbishop adopted the wiser plan of supplementing the clerical force by a contingent of lay helpers, who were permitted to say the Litany and read the Homilies in the destitute churches, but not, of course, to trespass on those functions that are strictly clerical. The lamentable effects of the queen’s extortions, however, were long observable in every diocese. The answers to Parker’s circular of 1561 revealed a fearful deficiency of suitable ministers. From the diocese of Norwich more than four hundred benefices are reported as without incumbents. In 1563, of one hundred and eighteen clergy in the archdeaconry of Middlesex, only three are reported as “Docti Latine et Græce;” forty-three come under the heading “Latine parum aliquid.”² It may be presumed that the country clergy were not superior to their London brethren.

Lay helpers
appointed.

In 1562 a great sensation was caused by the appearance of Bishop Jewel’s “Apology,” a book which still ranks among the classical literature of Anglicanism. The writer’s personal history had hardly been such as to augur any achievement requiring fixed religious principles. In Mary’s reign Jewel had, under intimidation, recanted all that could offend the inquisitors; he repented and fled abroad, to become, like many other refugees, infected with a Puritanism which was afterwards discarded. He appears to have reached his

Jewel’s
“Apology,”
A.D. 1562.

¹ Parker’s Correspondence, p. 120.

² This is in a catalogue of the year 1563, cited by Gibson in a letter to Pepys: see Short’s History of the Church of England, vol. i. p. 355.

CHAP.

XI.

unassailable theological position as early as June 18, 1559, when, in a sermon at Paul's Cross, he declared the true Anglican principle—divergence from Rome only where Rome is mediæval and not primitive. In this sermon he challenges proof “by the Scriptures, or by the example of the primitive Church, or by the old doctors, or by the eminent General Councils,” of some twenty-eight mediæval tenets, and in the ensuing controversy he was in the main successful. The “Apology” undertakes the safer task of disproving such Romanist allegations as that the Anglican body “had rebelliously withdrawn from the Catholic Church;” that “as for the authority of the ancient Fathers and old Councils, we set them at nought:” “that all ancient ceremonies, such as by our grandfathers and great-grandfathers, now many ages past, . . . were approved, we had rashly and arrogantly abolished.” This defence of the catholicity of our Church was soon translated into almost all the languages of Europe. Harding of Louvain attempted to answer it, taking as his basis the principle which the Council of Constance had disowned—that the Bishop of Rome is infallible. Jewel retorted with a “Defence of the ‘Apology’” in 1569.

The
“Bishops’
Bible.”
A.D. 1568.

As early as 1562 the “Bishops’ Bible” was in project, if not actually begun. The last translation effected in England was that revision of the work of Rogers and Coverdale which had been issued with a preface by Cranmer in 1540, and which was commonly called the “Great Bible.” During the Marian persecution the English refugees at Geneva, with the assistance of foreign divines, had brought out the “Geneva Bible.”¹ This work, which was superior to its predecessors as

¹ Whittingham, who had married Calvin’s sister, translated the whole of the New Testament, the most creditable part of the publication.

a translation, was marred by a commentary of an ultra-Protestant and levelling tone, wherein the sacred text was wrested to gratify the animus of party. Parker hoped to prepare a translation more worthy to be the authorized version of the English Church. Fourteen translators were appointed. The fact that most of them were bishops gave their production the name the "Bishops' Bible."¹ The new version came out in 1568. The rule had been that the translators should "make no use of bitter notes of any kind," nor "set down any determination in places of controversy." This was an improvement. The translation itself, however, was inaccurate, and the arrangement of the work was unsystematic and slovenly. The translators did not act in concert, and the time allowed them was probably insufficient. So far the "Bishops' Bible" deserved the hatred with which the Puritans always regarded it. Leicester, their patron, prevented its receiving royal sanction. Archbishop Grindal, Parker's successor, appears to have looked with favour on the Genevan version. The "Bishops' Bible" was not authorized² till 1604, when about to be superseded by the version now in use.

Measures of great importance were passed in the Convocation which met on January 29, 1563. The Precisians obtained, probably through the manœuvring of some of the bishops, a strong footing in this Convocation. It had seemed advisable to Parker that a code of Articles should be published, laying down fixed limits for pulpit teaching. Eleven Articles had been already compiled to serve this purpose. It

¹ Parker himself translated Genesis, Exodus, the two first Gospels, and all the Epistles of S. Paul except Romans and Corinthians. He is also credited with the Prefaces to the Psalter, to the New Testament, and to the whole Bible.

² See Canon LXXX. of that year.

CHAP.
XI.

Revision of
Cranmer's
Forty-two
Articles.

Opposed
by the
Puritans in
Convoca-
tion.
A.D. 1563.

The queen
alters the
Articles.

was now proposed to secure the sanction of Convocation for a revised edition of Cranmer's Forty-two Articles. In preparing this edition Parker was assisted by Cox, Bishop of Ely; Guest, Bishop of Rochester; and Grindal, Bishop of London. The Articles in the course of this revision were reduced to their present number, thirty-nine. We have already noticed the changes made at this time, few of which are of much doctrinal importance. We have also pointed out that the Articles were not intended as a confession of faith, but only as a barrier to pulpit extravagance. The Puritan extreme was the one addicted to doctrinal vagaries, and its representatives in this Convocation regarded the enforcement of the Articles as a grievous outrage. The prelates of both provinces passed them unanimously. But the Lower House of Canterbury reported that a minority therein refused to sign. It is not clear whether the malcontents submitted on this occasion; in 1571, when the Articles received a few finishing touches at the hands of Bishop Jewel, every member of Convocation had to subscribe, under penalty of expulsion. The Articles were laid before the queen for ratification. She appears to have disliked all such formularies, as tending to narrow the confines of the Church. She detained them nearly a year before she authorized them. When they came back they had undergone two important alterations. At the beginning of the twentieth Article appeared for the first time the clause "Habet ecclesia ritus¹ statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem." The twenty-ninth Article (that which declares that the wicked do not really participate in the Lord's Supper) was omitted. It was doubtless by the queen's directions that these changes had been

¹ The original clause does not contain the words *sive ceremonias*.

made.¹ There were thus two distinct recensions of the Articles. The English version of the Articles, printed by Jugg and Cawood at this time, was a third variant. This omitted the clause in the twentieth Article, but also omitted Article XXIX. The copy accepted by Convocation in 1571 includes both the disputed paragraphs. But it appears that the Act of Parliament which enforced clerical subscription, refers not to this copy, but to an English translation of the Convocational copy of 1563. Thus the opening clause of the twentieth Article did not receive parliamentary recognition. Laud was afterwards unjustly attacked by the Puritans as the author of this controverted clause. The doctrinal importance of the variation has been overestimated. Were the clause in Article XX. struck out, the same truth would remain embodied in Article XXXIV. The Articles of 1563 sanctioned the "Second Book of Homilies" as containing "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." This work had been previously accepted by Convocation. It appears that it had always been intended that the "Book of Homilies" of 1547 should be enlarged. Cranmer himself gives a promise of more Homilies at the end of the book, and in October, 1552, we find King Edward setting down "the making of more Homilies" in a memorandum of "matters to be considered." Clergy capable of composing sermons were now scarce; the demand for more Homilies was therefore urgent. The twenty-one discourses which were sanctioned by the Convocation of 1563 as the "Second Book of Homilies" were probably mainly composed or compiled by Parker

CHAP.
XI.

The
disputed
clauses
accepted
in 1571.

The
"Second
Book of
Homilies."

¹ Bishop Browne remarks, however, that "the clause itself was taken from the Lutheran Confession of Württemberg, from which source Archbishop Parker derived most of the additions which were made in Queen Elizabeth's reign to the Articles drawn up by Cranmer."—Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles, p. 469.

CHAP.
XL.

and Jewel. The Puritanical discourse, "Against peril of idolatry" (Homily II.), is noticeable as a concession to the rising faction. It is based upon an earlier production which Foxe publishes as a "treatise of Master Nicholas Ridley, in the name, as it seemeth, of the whole clergy." That Ridley had anything to do with it is uncertain. It is clearly taken from Bullinger's treatise, "De Origine Erroris, etc." The other Homilies appear unexceptionable. From royalty the Homilies received as tardy a recognition as the Articles. Elizabeth detained the book for a whole year before she gave it ratification. Homily XXII., "Against rebellion," was not written till 1570. It was occasioned by the rising in the north in the autumn of 1569. It was added to the Homilies by the Convocation of 1571.

Nowell's
Catechism
rejected.

A Catechism of a Puritanical tendency, based upon the production of Bishop Poynet, had been composed by Dean Nowell, now the prolocutor of the Lower House. He was extremely anxious to inflict it on the Church as an authoritative formula, and had vainly tried to get Cecil to countenance this narrowing scheme. In the present session of Convocation the Catechism was supported by the Puritan representatives, thirty-three in number, but failed to secure the approval of the House. In 1570 it was accepted by the Lower House, but did not pass the Upper.¹ It appears to have been a favourite contention with the men of this party that Nowell's Catechism had received synodical sanction.

The Puri-
tan mani-
festo in Con-
vocation.

The thirty-three also presented a scheme of seven Articles, levelled against certain customs retained by our Church. The scheme demanded that several saints' days should be abolished; that the sign of the cross

¹ Synodus Anglicana, 215.

in Baptism should be disused, as tending to superstition; that "forasmuch as divers communicants are not able to kneel during the time of Communion . . . and some also both superstitiously kneel and knock, that order of kneeling may be left to the ordinary;" that organs should be silenced; that the surplice should be the only dress of the minister in church; and that out of church the clergy should not wear "caps and gowns such as were customary among the Roman priesthood."¹ This extraordinary manifesto is to be ascribed almost entirely to the influence of the Low Church bishops and the Puritan court faction. Of the proctors representing the parochial clergy, only fourteen signed it. The remaining nineteen names are those of dignitaries—thirteen archdeacons, a provost, and five deans. A scheme of more insidious character was introduced in the Upper House by Bishop Sandys. He proposed to hand over the discipline and government of the Church to a committee appointed by the queen and working under the control of Parliament. This was just what such courtiers as Leicester desired. It is creditable to the Upper House that Sandys' scheme had not a single supporter.

We have already observed that Elizabeth was extremely averse to the system of irreverent Puritanism which was now infusing itself into the Church. We find that she was wont at this time to address the bishops on the subject in petulant and captious tones. Nevertheless, she would give Parker no assistance in his attempts to introduce a higher standard. This demeanour is partly attributable to policy; but the inconsistency is mainly due to the extraordinary influence of her favourite Leicester. Despite his detest-

The queen's
half-
hearted
support of
the Church.

Leicester's
influence.

¹ See Pryce, *England's Sacred Synods*, pp. 564, 565.

CHAP.

XL.

Dissenters
take Orders
in the
Church.

able character, this person posed as the champion of the Precisians. To the salutary measures devised by Parker and Cecil Earl of Burleigh, for maintaining Church discipline, he offered a violent opposition. The queen was too frequently induced to side with this unworthy favourite rather than with the well-wishers of the Church. Encouraged by this support, the ultra-Protestant faction assumed a menacing demeanour.

The benefices of the Church were being filled by men who had imbibed the spirit of the Calvinistic and Zuinglian systems, and whose views with regard to sacraments and means of grace were utterly at variance with the teaching of the English Church. These persons were advised by their continental friends to feign acceptance of the doctrines embodied in the Prayer-book, with the view of ultimately decatholizing the Church. Their real sympathies were rather with the horde of "Anabaptists, Arians, libertines, Free-will men, etc.," whose influx into England is deplored in Parker's letters. Sometimes, as in the case of Dean Turner, the Puritan mind expressed itself in open ridicule of those tenets and practices which distinguished Anglicanism from the sects. Tolerant though Parker was, he was not the man to fawn on the royal favourite, or quail before the clamour of faction. Craumer, under similar circumstances, had collapsed. Parker, to his lasting honour, maintained the principles of Anglicanism, despite the "*civium ardor prava jubentium*" and the "*vultus instantis tyranni*." We have observed elsewhere that deep principles have been often involved in vestiarian or ritualistic controversies of seeming insignificance. The differences between Anglo-Catholic and Puritan were on this occasion compressed within these narrow confines. The Puritans of set

Their
divergence
in ritual
gives
Parker a
vantage-
ground.

purpose conducted divine service with slovenly irreverence. Some would not kneel at Holy Communion; many would not even wear the surplice. The queen, roused to anger, admonished Parker that "there was crept and brought into the Church by some few persons abounding more in their own sense than wisdom, and delighting in singularities and changes, an open and manifest disorder and offence, specially in the external and decent and lawful rites and ceremonies to be used in the Church." He was ordered to confer with the other ecclesiastical commissioners and the ordinaries, and to proceed by order, injunction, or censure, so that uniformity might be established. Thus much and no more would the queen do for her religion. Policy and the personal influence of Leicester shifted the responsibility of all future proceedings on the archbishop's shoulders. Parker drew up Articles, but had to complain, "if the queen's majesty will not authorize them, the most part be likely to lie in the dust for execution." It appears that at last he decided that his powers as primate were sufficient to warrant the issue of a code of rules which should secure "decency, distinction, and order for the time." A book of "Advertisements" was accordingly drawn up, containing articles ranged under four heads: for doctrine and preaching; for administration of prayer and sacraments; for certain orders in ecclesiastical policy; and for outward apparel of persons ecclesiastical. This work was probably published early in 1565, but not generally circulated till March, 1566, when Parker sent it to Cecil for perusal. In his letter he remarks, "When the queen's highness will needs have me assay with mine own authority what I can do for order, I trust I shall not be stayed hereafter."¹ Though originally intended

The queen
evades the
responsibility.

Parker's
"Advertisements."
A.D. 1566.

¹ Parker Correspondence, p. 272.

CHAP.

XI.

Not sanc-
tioned by
the queen.

The
"Advertise-
ments"
specify the
minimum.

only as a temporary remedy, the "Advertisements" assumed a less questionable status in the next reign, when they were recognized as authoritative by Canon XXIV., which was ratified by the king. There is no reason to believe that they received royal sanction in the present reign. It need scarcely be said, therefore, that it was never imagined at this period that Parker's "Advertisements" were a "taking of further order" on the part of the queen, with respect to the ornaments prescribed by the rubric. Still less possible is it to suppose that any limitation of the ornaments sanctioned by the rubric was aimed at in the "Advertisements." Parker's publication was clearly intended only as a bye-law, giving practical shape to a statute hitherto inoperative. To force the Puritan clergy to adopt the ornaments of 1548, according to the strict letter of the rubric, was impossible. Parker wisely drew the line at the surplice and the fair linen cloth for the altar. Thus much he insisted on. To argue from this that he prohibited more, in defiance of the unrepealed rubric, is to pervert all that is known of the man, the measure, and the times.¹

¹ It will be borne in mind that the vestment controversies of our own day have given the "Advertisements" of Archbishop Parker a somewhat spurious importance. The "Act of Uniformity" had enjoined the use of such vestments as had sanction in 1548, "until the queen should take further order." The chasuble, alb, and tunicle were therefore at this time the legal dress of the celebrant, although there is reason to believe that these vestments were seldom worn. Parker's "Advertisements," however, make no mention of any other dress besides the surplice as necessary "at the ministration of the Sacrament in the ordinary parish churches." Nobody who knows under what circumstances the "Advertisements" were published can doubt that the surplice is thus specified in view of Puritan slovenliness, as the minimum that would be tolerated in the way of "apparel for all persons ecclesiastical." In modern times, however, under the pressure of influences which need not be particularized, it has been ruled that "omission is to be considered as prohibition;" and that the "Advertisements," which never received the formal sanction of the Crown, and did not introduce any modification in our Prayer-book's rubrics, were in reality a "taking of further order" on the part of the queen, who, in point of fact, took pains to disown them in 1576. By this manipulation of history the conclusion is arrived at that the Eucharistic vestments

We notice the most interesting directions in the "Advertisements" under the four heads given above:—

CHAP.

XI.

Excerpts
from the
"Advertisements."

I. Clergy are to excite the people to frequent communion: clergy who preach on matters tending to dissension or "derogation of the religion and doctrine received" ought to be reported to the bishop or ordinary. II. Common prayer is to be said in such part of the church¹ "as the ordinary shall think meet for the largeness and straightness of the church . . . so that the people may be most edified." In cathedrals and colleges Holy Communion is to be celebrated at least once a month: the celebrant to use a cope "with gospeller and epistoller agreeably." At other services the surplice is to be worn. "And any minister saying any public prayers or ministering the sacraments shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." The Communion Table is to be decently covered with carpet, silk, etc., and at time of celebration, with a fair linen cloth. All communicants are to receive kneeling. Basins are not to be used at baptism in lieu of the font. The bell is to be tolled for every "Christian body" who "is in passing. . . . After the time of his passing" only one short peal is to be rung. When fairs or markets fall on a Sunday there is to be no showing of wares till service be done. III. Archdeacons are to "appoint the curates to certain taxes of the New Testament, to be conned without book." Churchwardens are to report to the ordinary those "which will not readily pay their penalties for not coming to God's service." No person is to marry within the degrees set forth in the archbishop's table² of 1563. IV. Archbishops and bishops are to

were prohibited by royal authority in the year 1565-66. Such is the acknowledged basis of the "Purchas judgment," which made the use of these vestments penal. Messrs. Maccoll and Parker have exhaustively exposed the fallacies which underlie these assumptions. Were it not a practical matter, the idea of this "malleus Puritanorum" being dug up to belabour the very party in whose interests it was forged would perhaps provoke a smile. In view, however, of the persecution of the Rubricists for which this decision was the apology, impartial persons must deplore a flagrant miscarriage of justice.

¹ The Puritanical had been aggrieved by the occasional use of the chancel for prayers, and would fain have prohibited this use as a relic of popery.

² This table, which has been retained unaltered in our Prayer-books, was drawn up by Archbishop Parker, to counteract the lax teaching on the subject which foreign Protestantism was now instilling into English minds.

CHAP.

XI.

"use and continue their accustomed apparel." Deans, archdeacons, doctors of divinity, and others are to wear in their common apparel abroad "a side gown with sleeves straight at the hand," and "to wear tippets of sarcenet." The "inferior ecclesiastical persons" are to wear lay gowns and the square cap. The nonjuring clergy are to wear "none of the said apparel . . . but to go as mere laymen till they be reconciled to obedience."

The "Advertisements" illustrated by Cecil's letter.

The necessity of some of these directions is shown by Cecil's summary of the diocesan reports in 1564. Among other marks of disorder are mentioned these: "Some say [the service and prayers] in a surplice, others without a surplice; . . . in some places the table hath a carpet, in others it hath not; . . . administration of the Communion is done by some with surplice and cap, some with surplice alone, others with none: . . . some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting."¹

Puritan protests.

Even the moderate demands of the "Advertisements" were offensive to the Puritan faction. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, wrote to Leicester for protection against the cap and surplice, urging that "in all Reformed countries the belief and habit of the Roman Church are dismissed together" and "that the godly in other countries would . . . be strangely shocked with these reforms." To like effect wrote Whittingham, who by Leicester's influence retained the deanery of Durham, though not really in Orders. If, he argues, the indifferency of the dress be urged, yet it is undeniable it ought to be to the glory of God, and "How can God's glory be promoted by the equipage of idolatrous worship?" He pretends to find an analogy in that jealous abstention from the usages of heathens and heretics which was considered necessary in the early Church. Leicester, of course, abetted the aggrieved Puritans. Their

¹ See Strype's Parker, ii. 2, fol. ed.

cause had also the support of the Earls of Bedford and Warwick, and of Walsingham, Knolles, and an influential party in the Commons. Parker, however, and the other commissioners were resolved to exert their authority and end the reign of disorder. About a hundred and forty refractory London clergy were cited before the commissioners at Lambeth, and required to make the declaration of conformity attached to the "Advertisements." Some thirty-seven refused, and were consequently suspended or deprived. Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, and Humphreys, President of Magdalen, Oxford, were cited, as also the most flagrant offender of all, Turner, Dean of Wells. Turner and Sampson were deprived. Humphreys obtained a respite and ultimately conformed. It appears that the cause of the London Puritans excited much sympathy at Cambridge. The students refused to wear surplices, and their insubordination was countenanced by the masters of Trinity and S. John's.

Non-con-
forming
clergy
cited.
A.D. 1568.

The conduct of the opposite faction in 1569-70 gained the Puritans a short-lived and unmerited popularity. The policy of Rome on the accession of Elizabeth has been noticed. Paul IV. had been succeeded in 1559 by a more sagacious pontiff, Pius IV. Convinced that nothing was to be gained in England by hostility to the throne, Pius made friendly overtures to Elizabeth. We have it on good authority that he offered to sanction the Prayer-book of 1559, provided the English Church recognized the supremacy of Rome.¹ The pressure of the Puritans rendered it impossible to accept reconciliation on such terms. In 1566 Pius V. became Pope, and this conciliatory policy was discarded. The first

Romanist
hostilities.

¹ See Twissen, *Historical Vindication of the Church of England in point of Schism*, p. 175.

CHAP.
 XI.

effect of his hostility was the rising in the north, under the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, in 1569. The insurgents professed a determination to overthrow the Reformation and re-establish the Pope. The chief agents in this affair were foreign seminarists. In the next year Pope Pius V. took a step which not only drove England to the side of the Protestant powers, but necessitated the prohibition of Romanism by penal laws. He published a bull excommunicating Elizebeth, and denouncing her as a usurper; her subjects were commanded to repudiate their allegiance under pain of excommunication. This bull was found posted on the doors of London House (April, 1570).¹ The advanced Catholics in the ranks of the clergy seem to have remained faithful to the throne at this crisis, and the queen's confidence in their loyalty was declared in her manifesto. The Commons, however, thought fit to subject all clergymen to a test of loyalty in a religious garb. Every clergyman, whether ordained with the present formulary or that in use under Mary, was to declare his assent to the Thirty-nine Articles. No one henceforth was to be ordained till he had subscribed them. Every incumbent was to read the

The
 Thirty-nine
 Articles
 made a test
 of loyalty.

¹ The Romish schism in England dates from this year. Its adherents were at first governed by priests with special commissions from Rome, then by bishops *in partibus*. In our own time Cardinal Wiseman introduced the practice of giving these intruders English titles. The backbone of the faction in 1570 was Dr. William Allen, formerly Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He fled to Louvain on Elizabeth's accession, and devoted his life to a crusade against the Anglican Church. Allen was placed at the head of the seminary at Douay, established at the cost of Philip II. in 1568. He was subsequently made a cardinal. William Persons, a Jesuit, became rector of another seminary at Rome, and similar establishments were founded at Valladolid and S. Omer in Artois. Persons and Campion were at the head of the Jesuit propagandists who entered England with the view of effecting the deposition or assassination of Elizabeth. Campion was executed under circumstances of great cruelty. But the emissaries suffered not for their religion, but their hostility to the throne. Mr. Hallam admits that any man in this reign might have saved his life by denying the Pope's power to depose the queen (Const. History, vol. i. ch. iii. p. 164).

Articles to his congregation within two months of his induction. The queen did not share in this panic, and had, as we have already observed, some antipathy to the Articles. The Act was carried in defiance of royal prohibition. When passed, the queen was prudent enough to give way and grant her assent. The Convocation which sat at the same time paved the way for the Act by issuing that final revision of the Articles which has been already noticed.

Though the Puritans were the party most averse to subscription, the anti-Roman panic was, of course, turned to the detriment of the Anglo-Catholics. At Cambridge Thomas Cartwright, Margaret Professor of Divinity, denounced the Anglican system in such terms that Whitgift, the vice-chancellor, was forced to put the statutes in force, and to expel him from his office.¹ His friends in the Commons were not so easily suppressed. The matter came to a climax in 1572, when Mr. Wentworth actually brought in two "Bills of Reformation," proposing to reconstruct the Church after the model of the Calvinistic sects. Now at last the queen interposed. She signified to the Speaker her desire that bills respecting religion should not be discussed until accepted by Convocation. She demanded Mr. Wentworth's bills, read them, returned them with strong expressions of disapproval, and ordered that the matter should drop. Baulked in the House, the faction betook itself to the arena of controversial literature. Five or six of the leading Puritan divines,

Cartwright
at Cam-
bridge.

Went-
worth's
"Bills of
Reforma-
tion."
A.D. 1572.

¹ Thomas Cartwright ranks first in learning and ability among the non-conforming Puritans of this reign. The spread of Puritanism at Cambridge was mainly due to his teaching in the lecture-room and university pulpit. The "Second Admonition" is entirely his work. Whitgift, as primate, behaved with great generosity to Cartwright. It is said that the latter modified his views in later life, and on his deathbed expressed his regret for the trouble he had given to the rulers of our Church.

CHAP.

XI.

The "First
and Second
Admoni-
tion."

Tests
applied to
suspected
clergymen.

Death of
Matthew
Parker.

aided by Cartwright, who was now living at Antwerp, composed an elaborate treatise against the Church. It is styled the "First and Second Admonition," and consists of two religious theses addressed to Parliament. The doctrine and discipline which these men had hitherto pretended to accept were now bitterly denounced, and the Calvinistic principles advocated. The appearance of this work caused a great sensation. The queen, to whose inertness this upgrowth of dissent was mainly due, had the audacity to attribute it to episcopal negligence. She now appointed a body of lay commissioners, who should assist the bishops in making search for non-conforming clergy. The tests to which suspected incumbents were subjected were the three afterwards applied to all clergymen by Archbishop Whitgift. A declaration was to be subscribed approving of the Prayer-book, Articles, and royal supremacy. Forms of recantation for such as had been hitherto disorderly were provided. The three tests worked a salutary clearance in one diocese where the charge of negligence was indeed well deserved. Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, was a notorious fautor of the sectaries. According to Neal, three hundred non-conforming priests were discovered in this diocese and suspended. An answer to the "Admonitions" was written by Cartwright's old enemy, Whitgift.

On May 17, 1575, the Church of England lost the prelate who had so wisely guided her course through this stormy and perplexing period, and whose claims on the gratitude of posterity are enhanced, because he reaped little but hostility and indifference while living. "Almost entirely by his skill," it has been well said, "the vessel he was called to pilot has been saved from breaking on the rock of mediæval superstitions, or else

drifting away into the whirlpool of licentiousness and unbelief.”¹ Despite his naturally retiring and cautious disposition, Matthew Parker’s services as primate place him on a level with the *præclara nomina* of Canterbury—with Theodore, Langton, and Laud. Parker’s literary performances in connection with the Articles and Homilies have been mentioned. It may be noticed that he was the earliest explorer in the field of Anglo-Saxon literature, his researches in this direction being ever inspired by the conviction that the Church over which he presided was one with the Church of Augustine and Bede and Elfric. Matthew Parker’s library, the last and most valuable of numerous benefactions to his *alma mater*, is still the pride of Corpus Christi, Cambridge. Parker enjoyed the extreme ill will of the Puritans, because his sound wisdom and large-hearted tolerance had allowed them neither to decatholicize the Church nor to pose as martyrs. Their malignity survived for years after his death. It at last had the gratification of insulting his memory, as the Marian inquisitors had insulted that of Bucer, his body being torn up from its resting-place in Lambeth Chapel and cast on a dunghill, in the troublous times of Charles I. The remains were recovered and re-interred by Sancroft.

¹ Hardwicke *Hist. of the Articles*, p. 117.

CHAPTER XII.

Elizabeth—*continued.*

A.D. 1576-1603.

Edmund Grindal primate—His Puritanical proclivities—The “prophesyings”—Grindal falls foul of the queen—Grindal under suspension—Comes to terms with the queen—John Whitgift primate—Disorderly sectaries—The Independents—The Anabaptists—The Familists—Many clergymen Dissenters at heart—Whitgift not intimidated—Whitgift’s three tests—The Puritan clergy cannot accept these tests—Their patrons at court try conclusions with Whitgift—Whitgift’s twenty-four Articles—Reaction against Puritans—The Marprelate libels—Puritanism in disrepute—State of the Church at the end of the reign—The bishops are becoming despotic—Episcopal courts—Erastian opinions—Hooker’s “Ecclesiastical Polity”—The Sunday question—The Predestination controversy—The Lambeth Articles—Not accepted by the Church—Yet Calvinistic views still predominate.

Edmund
Grindal
primate.

THE Elizabethan Reformation is so much the work of Matthew Parker, that the student will not be detained long by the remaining twenty-eight years of this reign. In her choice of a new primate the queen was singularly unfortunate. Edmund Grindal had been chaplain to Bishop Ridley, and in Mary’s reign was one of the refugees. He settled at Strasburg, where he is heard of as trying to mediate between the factions which disturbed the peace of the English at Frankfort. He returned in 1558, and was selected on account of his learning to take a leading part in the religious settlement. He has been mentioned as one of the royal visitors, and as one of the commissioners who revised the Prayer-book. Grindal entertained a far lower view of the Church than that which guided his friends Parker and Burleigh. He deferred to the opinions of

Bullinger and other foreigners of inferior attainments to himself, and allowed the Puritan party in his diocese of London to get the upper hand. Archbishop Parker respected the piety and learning of his suffragan, but must often have been grieved by his lax administration. It was, perhaps, to get rid of him that he used his interest to secure Grindal the northern primacy in 1570. In the north Puritan innovations were unpopular. Grindal's "Articles of Visitation"¹ tell us that the primate of the north warred with unnecessary intolerance against certain time-honoured practices and ceremonies which pious minds found useful as accessories to devotion. He forbids the custom of praying on beads, and that of making the sign of the cross on entering church; the priests are not to use gestures not specified by the Prayer-book; the consecrated bread is not to be put in the mouths of the communicants; nor are stone altars to be used. That such a prelate was promoted to the vacant throne at Canterbury can only be accounted for by the influence of Leicester and other pretended Puritans at court. Their Puritanism being merely ill will to an institution which they wished to despoil, it was natural this faction should desire a Low Churchman at Canterbury. Grindal became primate of all England on February 15, 1576. His principles soon set him at issue with the queen herself, and the dispute and its results are all we need record of this primacy. The Puritanical clergy had for some time delighted in an exercise which they called "prophesying." They assembled from time to time at selected centres for the purpose of discussing a prescribed religious topic. In deference to S. Paul's injunctions in 1 Cor. xiv. 31, the members of these assemblies "prophesied one by

The "prophesying."

¹ See Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*, vi. 501.

CHAP.

XII.

one"—in other words, debated in turn on the text or topic under treatment—and a president, to whom they gave the Presbyterian title "moderator," summed up. The "prophesyings" are first heard of at Northampton in 1571. They became particularly popular in the Norwich diocese. Harmless enough ostensibly, this exercise was likely to lead to dangerous results in a period of unsettled religious opinion. The temptation to decry tenets and practices which the "Acts of Uniformity" and "Supremacy" had made sacrosanct would probably be irresistible. So thought the queen and Matthew Parker. The latter succeeded in suppressing the "prophesyings" even in the Norwich diocese, where Parkhurst's opposition was abetted by four privy councillors. The new Archbishop of Canterbury was rash enough to attempt to revive the objectionable practice. He issued some printed directions for the management of "prophesyings." The queen gave a peremptory order that the exercise should be discontinued. Grindal declined to countenance this invasion of his jurisdiction. He wrote a letter defending the "prophesyings," and complaining of the queen's interference in matters of faith and religion—"things of which nature," he urged, "are to be decided in the Church, and not in the palace." That this was a well-deserved rebuke is undeniable, whatever our opinion of the merits of "prophesyings." The queen, however, was unmoved. She proceeded to write to the bishops herself. She declared that "by setting up unlawful assemblies the people were drawn to places remote from their parishes, and entertained with disputations upon points of divinity very improper for a vulgar audience;" and "that by this means many of her subjects were carried off to idleness and schism." The bishops were commanded not to

Grindal
falls foul of
the queen.
Dec. 1576.

suffer any public religious exercises besides those of the Prayer-book and the Sunday sermon of the incumbent. If the incumbent was not qualified to preach, he was to read one of the Homilies. For his disrespect to royal authority Grindal was confined to his house and suspended for six months. When this period had elapsed, he was urged to make some acknowledgment of his fault to the Star Chamber; but he refused to be restored to royal favour on such terms. It appears that the queen seriously thought of depriving Grindal. Her Council persuaded her to be satisfied with his sequestration *ab officio*. What was the extent of this penalty is not plain. Grindal certainly issued charges, and even served as an ecclesiastical commissioner, while under sequestration. In other functions he appears to have been represented by his friend Whitgift, now Bishop of Worcester. The primate's resistance was regarded with approval by a great many of the queen's subjects, and both Houses of Convocation addressed petitions to the queen, imploring her to reinstate him. Grindal, on the other hand, who was growing old and blind, was anxious to resign the archbishopric. This the despotic sovereign would not allow. It appears that a compromise was effected in 1582. In that year the writs and instruments again run in Grindal's own name; and Strype gives a letter of the same date in which the primate tenders a qualified submission. He shortly afterwards received permission to resign on a pension. Before the negotiations on this subject were completed, Grindal had died, worn out by old age and increasing infirmities (July 6, 1583). It appears that the queen became more reconciled to the "prophesyings." In 1585 the Bishop of Chester, in giving directions for their conduct, speaks of them as approved of by her Majesty's Privy Council.

CHAP.
XII.

Grindal
under
suspension.

Comes to
terms with
the queen.

CHAP.

XII.

John
Whitgift
primate.
A.D. 1583.

In her next appointment of a primate Elizabeth was more judicious. We have already mentioned John Whitgift as taking an active part against Cartwright at Cambridge. Whitgift was one of the many great divines of this period whose names are connected with Pembroke Hall. He was befriended and patronized by Bishop Ridley, and is said to have been one of his chaplains. In 1555 he became a fellow of Peterhouse, and during the troubles of Mary's reign he was allowed to continue his studies at Cambridge unmolested. Shortly after Elizabeth's accession he was elected to the headship of Peterhouse and Pembroke, and in 1570 became Master of Trinity. His fame as a preacher extending to the Court, he was honoured with marked favour by Elizabeth, and was appointed Dean of Lincoln. The Puritan faction at Cambridge were probably more noisy than numerous. When Whitgift finally left the university for the see of Worcester, in 1576, he was attended by an immense cavalcade of friends and admirers. The appointment of Whitgift as Grindal's successor was extremely popular, and he did not disappoint the public expectation. He was the better able to do justice to his high office in that he was a man of large private means, and therefore was less hampered than his predecessors by the impoverishment of the see and the queen's continual exactions. Whitgift's chief claim to distinction is his success as a disciplinarian. It was at this time absolutely necessary that something should be done to suppress the turbulence of the ultra-Protestants, who, during Grindal's primacy, had met with little opposition. The Precisians had already gone the length of forming a distinct sect, and in 1573 established their first "presbytery" at Wandsworth. They were rivalled by three other

Disorderly
sectaries.

sectarian systems—the Brownists, afterwards notorious as the sect of Congregationalists or Independents; the Anabaptists; and the Familists, or Family of Love. The distinguishing traits of the first-named sect were disintegration and rejection of authority—each congregation being allowed to choose its own forms of doctrine and discipline. The principles of Christianity were thus placed at the mercy of the ignorant many. It was taught that private interpretation of Scripture was the foundation of religion; and that not the wise or learned, but the man who made most show of piety, was the soundest interpreter. What hypocrisy, arrogance, and ignorant bigotry this system engendered was seen in the next century, when the great movement in favour of constitutional government brought the “Independents” to the fore and tested their pretensions as friends of liberty. The founder of the sect was Robert Brown, a Puritan Norfolk clergyman, who disturbed England by rancorous abuse of the Church during the years 1570–1580. It is shameful to record that while two ignorant followers who circulated his scurrilous pamphlets were hanged, the real author of the mischief was repeatedly restored to liberty by the influence of Lord Burleigh, his kinsman. Being at last menaced by the High Commission Court, he retired to Holland, the nursery of Protestant eccentricities. Even here his love of dissidence embroiled him. In Scotland, equally full of religious discord and confusion, Brown got imprisoned, and he preferred to tax again the mercies of the English Church. His turbulent conduct at Northampton induced the bishop of the diocese to excommunicate him. Shortly after this sentence, he appears to have been pricked with remorse. He recanted, and making his peace with the Church obtained a living, where he died

CHAP.

XII.

The Anabaptists.

at an advanced age, in 1630. But the fire which this eccentric person had thrown in sport was not quenched by his conversion. To the Anabaptists we have frequently alluded as a most dangerous sect of socialists, whose turbulence from time to time roused the righteous indignation of the secular powers, and made Gallios pose as champions of Church discipline. In the exercise of their private judgment these sectaries denied all rights of property and all forms of government. They consecrated incest and adultery by renouncing, on religious principles, the customary restraints on sexual intercourse. On the same plea they broke every engagement or pledge by which the magistrates bound them to keep the peace. This sect gave the authorities even more trouble than the newly formed Romish party. The severities of Henry's, Edward's, and Mary's reigns were again found necessary, and the queen insisted that the penalty should be burning, not, as Foxe the martyr-logist desired, hanging. The Familist sect was one of the many strange formations which trace their birth to that ultra-Protestant principle which has been termed "Bibliolatry." By dreaming over the text of Scripture the Familists evolved an absurd system of mysticism. They appear to have denied the *facts* of the Incarnation, Resurrection, etc., while treating the letter of the sacred history with a reverence like that of the Jewish Cabalists. These strange enthusiasts were often exposed to persecution, because confounded with the other really pernicious sects. They were, therefore, even more hostile to the ultra-Puritans than to the Church.

The Familists.

Many clergymen Dissenters at heart.

While such were the leading forms of dissent when Whitgift was appointed to the primacy, the Church itself still contained a traitorous clique, who had taken Orders with the deliberate intention of subverting the

Anglican system and substituting for the Prayer-book some such work as Cartwright's "Book of Discipline." Among this party aspirants to the ministry were required to submit to a "call" from a *classis* or assembly of Puritan clergymen. The call was, of course, regarded as the real sacrament of Orders. For the episcopal system and all Catholic ceremonial these men had a downright hatred. How far this might be disguised for the sake of expedience was a favourite topic of discussion in the *classis*. When unrestrained, these Puritan clergy would openly deny the efficacy of the sacraments, and rail against the Liturgy. The one religious exercise which they revered was their own preaching.¹

The work which lay before Whitgift was just such as suited his abilities. He was not a persecutor, as he has been represented by the Congregationalist historians, but he understood the importance of discipline, and could maintain it. He was determined that the Church should no longer be the cat's-paw of the Puritan clerical "ring" and its self-seeking partisans at court. What Whitgift's boldness was when a righteous cause was to be maintained, may be inferred from the plain-spoken rebuke which he had addressed to the queen before his translation to Canterbury. He did not shrink from telling Elizabeth that the spoliation of the Church which she had sanctioned was a violation of the Great Charter, and a deviation from the practice of Christian rulers.² The queen probably respected him

Whitgift
not intimi-
dated.

¹ The diocese of Norwich, under the administration of Bishop Parkhurst, had become a hotbed of nonconformity of this type. Complaints of this diocese were made before Convocation, in 1586, "that unworthy persons were ordained and instituted; . . . the Communion not at all, or but in part, used and observed; . . . the wearing of the surplice refused; . . . the Communion was received by many sitting, and those that conformed to the Church called 'time-servers.'"—Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. ii. p. 565.

² See the letter in Whitgift's Works, vol. iii. p. xlii.

CHAP.
XII.

Whitgift's
three tests.
A.D. 1583.

the more for this honest expression of opinion. At all events, Whitgift lost nothing by it. The task of purging the clerical body was made easier for Whitgift by the queen's enforcement of the three tests in 1583. The statutes required, though the bishops seldom applied the test, that the Prayer-book, Articles, and royal supremacy should be acknowledged by all clergymen. The Puritans disliked the Prayer-book, chafed under the doctrinal restrictions of the Articles, and were as opposed to royal supremacy on anarchical principles as the Romanists were from deference to the Pope. Whitgift, after consultation with the bishops of his province, drew up some canons, wherein these three tests were set forth as the Church's security against false brethren.

The sixth canon, which embodied these tests, runs thus:—

“That none be permitted to preach, read, catechize, minister the sacraments, or execute any ecclesiastical function, by what authority soever he be admitted thereto, unless he first consent and subscribe to these Articles following before the ordinary of the diocese.”

The three Articles are—

(1) That the queen has supreme power over her subjects of all estates, and that no foreign “Power, prelate, State, or potentate” has any jurisdiction, power, etc., in this realm. (2) That the Prayer-book and ordinal contain nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that the subscriber will use the form of the said book prescribed, in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, and none other. (3) That the subscriber “alloweth” the Book of Articles agreed upon in the Convocation of 1562, and “believeth” them “to be agreeable to the Word of God.”

The need of discipline can be appreciated when we

CHAP.
XII.

The Puri-
tan clergy
cannot
accept
these tests.

Their
patrons at
court try
conclusions
with
Whitgift.

Whitgift's
twenty-
four
Articles

find that these three reasonable tests, which are in effect still applied to every candidate for ordination, drew from the Puritan clergy a howl of indignation. The tests were nothing new, but the bishops had hitherto been careless or indifferent, and men who hated the Prayer-book had taken Holy Orders for the sake of emolument, or with the more traitorous purpose of undermining the Anglican system. Henceforth the bishops were to see that their clergy literally subscribed to the crucial propositions, and the shifty evasions of the Puritan clergy were rendered impossible. Several were deprived. They appealed to their lay patrons at court, and the Council, not knowing what sort of man they had to deal with, summoned Whitgift with the intention of cowing him. The archbishop replied that he himself was the proper person to hear the complaints of the deprived ministers, and that "the matter was not incident to that honourable board." The queen was wise enough to express her sympathy with the primate, and the Council thought it better to be silent. Whitgift, who ever blended mercy with justice, showed the greatest deference to individual scruples, and won over many of the malcontents. He was determined, however, that the Church should be thoroughly purged of Dissenters in clerical disguise, and he supplemented his former publication with a body of twenty-four Articles which suspected clergymen might be called upon to sign. The Articles were not well devised, and this proceeding, besides infuriating Leicester, Knolles, and the Puritan statesmen, elicited a remonstrance from one of the soundest Churchmen, Cecil Lord Burleigh. A fierce battle was for some time carried on between the two parties. Bills, supported by popular petitions, were moved in the Commons in 1584 and 1587, to the

CHAP.
XII.Reaction
against
Puritans.The
Marprelate
libels.
A.D. 1588.

effect that episcopacy should be abolished and a Puritan "Directory" substituted for the Prayer-book. The queen's firm support of Whitgift prevented the anti-Church party from securing any advantage. Soon their own rancour and malignity completely alienated the sympathy of Parliament from the victims of Whitgift's wholesome severity. "A reaction against the Puritans set in, which, before the end of the reign, was completely established. They did not again become popular until the mischievous policy of the Stuart kings had associated their cause with that of liberty and justice." For now the aggrieved began to have recourse to practices which naturally rendered them odious to all honest Englishmen. The expedient of libelling their opponents in scurrilous anonymous pamphlets had been tried by the ultra-Protestant school in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. In the literature which was now published under the name of "Martin Marprelate," the clergy and the principles of the Church of England were defamed with an unscrupulous malignity hitherto unparalleled. The attacks were extended to the queen and the statesmen who supported the Church. The "Martin Marprelate" libels emanated from a movable printing press, which was shifted from town to town. It was at last captured at Manchester by the Earl of Derby, and finally suppressed. The parties chiefly implicated in this affair were Throgmorton and Fenner, and two suspended ministers, Penry and Nicholas Udal. Penry, proving impervious to leniency, was executed in 1593. Udal died shortly after his imprisonment. The guilt of the libellers was heightened by their deliberately choosing for their occasion a period when the Government was harassed by the prospect of the Spanish invasion. The tracts have been reprinted

in modern times. They appear to be conspicuous rather for gross and foul invective than facetiousness.¹ The titles of some of these attacks are—"The Epistle to the Convocation House," "The Epitome," "Bishop Cooper's Admonition," "Ha' ye any work for a Cooper?" "The Protestation of Martin." Thomas Nash replied to the libels in pamphlets sometimes betraying real humour; and Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, was deputed to publish the answers of the several prelates who had been the objects of these foul aspersions, in a more serious work called "An Admonition to the People of England." Public feeling was soon on the side of the Church. How completely the libellers had alienated from their cause the sympathy of the Commons is shown by the Act passed in 1593, subjecting such as refused to attend divine service, or impugned the queen's authority in causes ecclesiastical, to imprisonment, and, in case of persistence, to banishment. The consequence of this measure was that the scurrilous contingent of the Puritan faction found it better to keep quiet, while those who were really actuated by conscientious scruples emigrated. Holland was especially favoured by the emigrants. "Churches were erected at Amsterdam, Arnheim, Middelburg, Leyden, and other places; and probably never in the history of human opinion have so many wild doctrines been broached, and so many strange practices set on foot, as by these expatriated Brownists and Barrowists in their sojourn among the Dutch."²

Puritanism
in dis-
repute.

The closing years of Elizabeth's reign were marked by the growing popularity of the Church. Obvious abuses, however, still lingered. Ever since the fall of

State of . .
the Church
at the end
of the
reign.

¹ See the *résumé* of choice terms in Heylin's *Presbyterians*, p. 281, or Perry's *Student's English Church History*, pp. 333, 334.

² Perry, *Student's Eng. Ch. Hist.*, p. 337.

CHAP.
XII.

The
bishops are
becoming
despotic.

Episcopal
courts.

Erastian
opinions.

the monasteries the episcopal order had maintained an undue predominance in the Anglican system. Again and again the sovereigns in this period had been forced by the non-compliant attitude of Convocation to invest the primate with despotic authority. The pretensions of Canterbury had added dignity to the other diocesans, and the bishopric too often appeared in the light of an embryo papacy. The episcopal courts were, moreover, badly managed, and, notwithstanding Whitgift's endeavours to reform them, retained a character for speculation and injustice. A struggle ensued between the secular and the ecclesiastical judges: the former endeavouring to take as many cases as possible out of the ecclesiastical sphere by means of "prohibitions" from the courts of common law. Even the Court of High Commission was subjected to these prohibitions. This antagonism was destined to lead to most serious results in the subsequent reigns. Another consequence of the bishops overriding Convocation was the infusion of Erastian sentiments among the clergy. Many of the earlier Elizabethan divines appear to lose sight of the Catholic claims of our Church, and to base the Anglican system mainly on the authority of the sovereign to appoint forms of Church government. Even Whitgift seems not to have recognized the weakness of such principles. Bancroft, Bishop of London, however, defended Anglicanism from a more tenable position, and boldly attacked the Presbyterian assumption that bishops were "unscriptural," in a memorable sermon at Paul's Cross in February, 1589.

Adrian Saravia, a foreign divine resident in England, took yet higher ground when he claimed for episcopacy divine origin, on the plea that the primitive Churches in every country had bishops, and that this would not

have been the case had not the Apostles regarded episcopacy as an essential part of the system founded by Christ.¹ Saravia's views are qualified in Hooker's celebrated treatise on "The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," published in 1600. Hooker, as Master of the Temple, had met with violent opposition from the Puritan Travers, who, though not properly ordained, but only "called" to the ministry by a congregation at Antwerp, had himself aspired to the mastership. Disappointed in this aim, Travers in his capacity as afternoon lecturer at the Temple endeavoured to controvert the doctrines preached by the Master in the morning. Archbishop Whitgift suspended Travers on the twofold charge of being disorderly and not being properly ordained,² and to justify his suspension Hooker wrote his famous work. Hooker, of course, holds with Saravia and Bancroft that the episcopal authority is derived from the Apostles themselves. He weakens his case, however, by admitting that inasmuch as the everlasting continuance of episcopacy was not enjoined, it might be conceivable that the Church should adopt some other system of government, upon urgent cause.

Hooker's
"Ecclesi-
astical
Polity."

The other burning controversies of the day related to the observance of the Sunday, and the doctrine of predestination. The features which now distinguish our insular Sunday from that of other nations were almost unknown in Elizabeth's reign, and divines only levelled their censures against buying, selling, and playing games during hours of divine service. The spirit in which the day was regarded is illustrated by the order in Parker's "Advertisements" that "in all fairs and

The
Sunday
question.

¹ Saravia, *De Diversis Ministorum gradibus*, published in 1591.

² See Strype's Whitgift, iii. 185; Hooker's Answer, § 17.

CHAP.
XII.

The pre-
destination
contro-
versy.

common markets falling upon the Sunday there be no showing of any wares *before the service be done.*" The first attempt to confound the Lord's Day with the Jewish Sabbath was made by a Puritan minister, Dr. Bound, in a work published in 1595. His disallowal of such Sunday sports as shooting, fencing, and bowling, caused no less astonishment than indignation, and was set down, perhaps with justice, to a desire to exalt the Sunday at the expense of the fasts and festivals of the Church. The observance of Sunday soon became a party question. Neither side would command the full sympathy of many modern religionists. The one held the views which were afterwards expressed in King James's "Book of Sports" wherein such amusements as archery, leaping, vaulting, morris-dances, etc., are enjoined for Sunday afternoons. The Puritan preachers, on the other hand, argued that "to throw a bowl on the Lord's Day was as great a sin as to kill a man."¹ That modification of the Puritan view which survived, almost unquestioned, through the Hanoverian period and till the present generation, is a memorial of the administration of Cromwell. The other controversy shows how strongly prepossessed the later Elizabethan divines were on behalf of the Calvinistic views of predestination and election. William Barrett, a fellow of Caius College, when preaching at Cambridge, appears to have decried the doctrines of "assurance," "irresistible grace," and "particular election," in terms which a modern English Churchman would think reasonable and orthodox. The Cambridge doctors were, however, so imbued with Calvinism, that Barrett was called upon by the vice-chancellor and the heads of houses to recant. The matter was eventually brought

¹ Heylin's *Presbyterians*, p. 310.

before Whitgift, and an assembly of divines was convened by him at Lambeth. It was actually proposed to commit the Church to the following tenets:—

CHAP.
XII.

The
Lambeth
Articles.

(1) God has from eternity predestinated some persons to life; others He has reprobated to death. (2) "This moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not the prevision of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything which may be in the predestinated, but only the will of the good pleasure of God." (3) The number predestinated is limited before, and cannot be increased or lessened. (4) Those not predestinated to life will of necessity be damned. (5) True faith and sanctification does not fall away, and "does not vanish in the elect either totally or finally." (6) A man endowed with justifying faith has certainty of remission of sins, and of eternal salvation. (7) Saving grace is not conferred on all men so as they may be saved if they will. (8) No man can come to Christ unless it is given to him and the Father draws him, but all men are not drawn by the Father. (9) It is not placed in the will or power of any man to be saved.

These nine Calvinistic propositions, which are known as the "Lambeth Articles," were particularly offensive to the queen. The university whence the poison had emanated was now to provide the antidote. Barrett's views were those accepted by Peter Baro, a learned Frenchman who held the Margaret Professorship. Baro preaching before the university, boldly maintained the opposite doctrine to that of the Lambeth Articles. Again the vice-chancellor appealed to the archbishop. But in the interval Whitgift had consulted with his more learned suffragan, Andrewes, and been warned of the Antinomian tendency of the Calvinistic paradox. He may also have allowed due weight to the fact that the queen and Burleigh were both opposed to the Lambeth Articles. He contented himself with ordering Baro not to meddle again with the disputed doctrines, and

Not ac-
cepted by
the Church.

CHAP.

XII.

Yet Calvin-
istic views
still pre-
dominate.

the Lambeth Articles were not brought before Convocation. On the death of Whitaker the Calvinist, the queen appointed as Regius Professor at Cambridge, Dr. Overall, afterwards Dean of S. Paul's and the author of the Catechism on the sacraments.

Oxford, which produced no divine of any eminence during this reign except Hooker, had become, under the patronage of Leicester the chancellor, and the tuition of such divines as Doctors Reynolds and Humphrey, even more Puritanical than the sister university. This tendency at Oxford may to some extent be regarded as a reaction from the Romanist proclivities of earlier days. According to Heylin, not only were "all the Calvinian rigours in matters of predestination and the points depending thereupon" now received at Oxford as the doctrine of the English Church, but "the Church of Rome was inveighed against as the 'whore of Babylon,' 'the mother of abominations;' the Pope as publicly maintained to be Antichrist or the man of sin; and that as positively and majestically as if it had been one of the Articles of the Christian faith."¹

¹ Heylin's Land, p. 51.

CHAPTER XIII.

James I.

A.D. 1603-1625.

Character of the reign—The term “Protestant” applied to the Church—The “Millenary Petition”—The Hampton Court Conference—Its results—The Prayer-book of 1604—The Bible of 1611—Its origin and history—Death of Whitgift—Bancroft Archbishop of Canterbury—The *ex-animo* test—The Canons of 1604—The Puritan controversy—Folly of Bancroft’s conduct—The absolutist theory—Suppression of Romanists—Restoration of episcopacy in Scotland—Abbot Archbishop of Canterbury—Two heretics burnt—The bishops and absolutist principles—Unfortunate position of the inferior clergy—The king’s “Book of Sports”—His delegates to the Synod of Dort—The king turns on the Calvinists—The Spanish match—Lord Keeper Williams—His attempt to oust Abbot from the primacy.

THE accession of a king who had shown favour to the Scotch Presbyterians was regarded by many faithful Churchmen with feelings of apprehension. The Puritans, hoping to gain by the change of dynasty, promptly despatched a message of congratulation to Elizabeth’s successor. Dr. Neville, Dean of Canterbury, was sent by the bishops with a similar message. He returned with royal promises of a reassuring character. James “would maintain the government of the late queen as she had left it settled.” The king’s patronage of Presbyterianism had really been only a piece of policy, and he had as little sympathy with the Puritans as Whitgift himself. James had, in fact, learnt from experience that the men who denied prelacy were easily persuaded to disparage monarchy. He accordingly took for his maxim the words, “No bishop, no king.”

CHAP.
XIII.Character
of the reign.

King James was well versed in theological literature, and took an active part in every religious controversy of his reign. His opinions were in a state of constant flux, and his undignified demeanour and utter want of common sense rendered his intrusion on the theological arena matter of regret to sober-minded Churchmen. Persecutors are not always men of fixed opinions; it is no anomaly, therefore, that in this reign the practice of punishing heresy with burning was resuscitated. The king's vacillation and cruelty were, however, surpassed by his appetite for adulation. Impatient of constitutional restraints, he used the bishops as tools to carry out a policy of absolutism; flatterers and men who professed to believe in the divine right of kings received ecclesiastical preferments, and the Church of England lost in this reign the allegiance of many lovers of civil and religious liberty who had no real objection to her doctrines. In one respect only the Church gained by the accession of James. A rabid controversialist by temperament, he looked at nonconformity from a more philosophical point of view than Elizabeth, and religious error, if persecuted, was at least tried on its own merits, and no longer confounded with the crime of high treason. Under his rule, therefore, the Erastian opinions so prevalent in the late reign gave place to a higher view of the relations of Church and State.

The general tendency of the reign was to emphasize sharply those distinctive features which separate the Anglican system both from Romanism and sectarianism. It may be noticed that to indicate this attitude the Church had now informally adopted the title "Protestant," giving it the sense of "Reformed Catholic." This appropriation of the term is sanctioned even by such Anglicans as Andrewes, Ken, and Laud. It is to

The term
"Protes-
tant" ap-
plied to the
Church.

be deplored, as having given rise to much misconception in modern times. Negative terms are seldom instructive as definitions, and the origin and continental use of this particular term forbade that it should permanently retain the force now claimed for it by the Anglo-Catholics—that of contradistinction both to Romanists and to English sectarian formations.¹ Yet it does not seem to have been anticipated that these latter, in all their countless varieties, should claim the same or a better right to the designation.

Still hoping to secure concessions from the new sovereign, some seven hundred and fifty-two Puritanical clergymen drew up what they called their “Millenary Petition,” detailing their objections to the Anglican system and petitioning for change. The document was temperately worded, and some of the exceptions taken on minor points of order and discipline appear sufficiently reasonable. The subjects of complaint were specified as “offences” concerning which it was humbly prayed that “some might be removed, some amended, some qualified.” They were detailed under four heads: (1.) As to the *Church service*: exception was taken to the interrogatories and the sign of the cross in the Baptismal Office, also to women’s administering Baptism in cases of emergency; to the Office of Confirmation; to the ring in the Marriage Office; to the cap and surplice worn by the clergy; and to the longsomeness of the Sunday service. It was asked that would-be communicants should be examined; that ministers should not teach the people to bow at the

¹ The term Protestant occurs in none of the Church’s formularies. At the Revolution, however, when our attitude towards Rome was viewed mainly in its political bearings, an oath to maintain the “Protestant Reformed religion established by law” was inserted in the Coronation Service. On the other hand, the sovereign is invested with the ring as “the ensign of kingly dignity and of defence of the Catholick Faith.”

The
“Millenary
Petition.”

CHAP.
XIII.

name of Jesus; that strict observance of the Lord's Day should be taught; that the terms "priest," "absolution," be corrected; and that the Apocrypha should not be read in church. (2.) As to *Ministers*: it was asked that none, for the future, be admitted but such as will preach diligently; that such as cannot preach be removed or pensioned; that non-residency be not permitted; that King Edward's statute for the lawfulness of ministers' marriages be revived; that the only test demanded should be the subscription to the Articles of Religion and the king's supremacy. (3.) As to *Church living and maintenance*: that bishops should not hold benefices *in commendam*; that other clergy should not have a plurality of benefices or dignities; that lay impropriations should be charged with a sixth or a seventh for clerical maintenance. (4.) As to *Church discipline*: that excommunication be issued according to Christ's institution, and that it should not proceed from lay persons, chancellors, officials, etc.; that registrars and others should not put their places out to farm; that the canons for the restraint of marriage at certain seasons be reversed, the longsomeness of suits in the ecclesiastical courts restrained, and the oath *ex officio* more sparingly used.

The petitioners styled themselves "ministers of the Gospel that desire not a disorderly innovation, but a due and godly reformation." They desired a conference between the Puritan and non-Puritan clergy on the topics above specified. Elizabeth had refused the Puritan party this concession. King James was more complaisant, regarding it as a good opportunity to display his theological attainments. Much excitement was caused by the publication of the petition. Oxford and Cambridge were particularly agitated at the prospect of

being mulct of their impropriations. The king quieted this anxiety by announcing that he would give the Puritans a fair hearing, but that he would do so with the object of protecting the Church, of which he declared himself to be a loyal member. A conference was accordingly opened at Hampton Court in January, 1604. It was devoid of official pretensions, having been summoned before the king had even been acknowledged by Parliament. This perhaps excuses certain informalities in the procedure. Certainly the promise of giving the Puritans a fair hearing cannot be said to have been fulfilled. They were represented by only four divines—Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Sparke from Oxford, and Mr. Knewstubbs and Mr. Chaderton from Cambridge; and these representatives were nominated, not from the Puritan platform, but by the king himself. The Church was represented by Whitgift, eight bishops, and ten learned divines. The king, who undertook to act as moderator, did not conceal his partiality, and replied to the arguments of the Puritans in a tone of offensive sarcasm. A preliminary meeting had been held by the king, the bishops, and five deans, with the lords of the Council, that the king might receive explanation on sundry points in the Anglican use. On four topics in particular he sought instruction, viz. Confirmation, Absolution, Lay Excommunication, and Private Baptism by women. To the last-named practice James appears to have been particularly averse. The conference really opened on January 16, and lasted three days. The age and infirmities of Whitgift prevented his taking an active part, and the chief spokesman of the Church party was Bancroft, Bishop of London. The objections of the Puritans were digested under four heads: I. Doctrine; II. Pastors; III.

CHAP.

XIII.

Sept. 1603.

The Hampton Court Conference.

CHAP.
XIII.

Church Government; IV. Ritual and Prayer-Book.

Its results.

The nature of the objections may be gathered from the summary of the "Millenary Petition" given above. It appears unnecessary to give a detailed account of the conference. The Puritans expressed themselves satisfied with its results, but probably only because they regarded the present as precursors of more important changes. The following is an account of the alterations sanctioned:—(1.) "Absolution" was defined by the addition of the words "or remission of sins." (2.) In three cases the Lectionary was altered by the substitution of portions of the Canonical Scriptures for portions of the Apocrypha. (3.) The prayer for the queen and royal family and the corresponding petition in the Litany were now introduced, as also the thanksgivings for rain, fair weather, plenty, peace, victory, and deliverance from plague. (4.) Trifling alterations were made in the text of the Gospels so as to adapt it to the text of the received translation. (5.) The rubrics of the Baptismal Office were altered so as not to allow of Private Baptism being performed by any but a "lawful minister." (6.) Confirmation was explained by the definition "or laying on of hands on children baptized and able to render an account of their faith according to the Catechism following." (7.) In view, perhaps, of the Puritan outcry for examination of communicants, a really substantial innovation was made by the addition to the Catechism of the section which treats of the sacraments. This important and valuable composition was the work of Dean Overall, Prolocutor of Convocation, and afterwards bishop.

The Prayer-
book of
1604.

The new Prayer-book was sanctioned by royal letters. The proclamation commands all public officers to assist the clergy in carrying out its injunctions, and ad-

monishes all persons "not to expect any further alteration in the public service." The sanction of Convocation was not applied for until 1662. This act of royal encroachment was perhaps considered to be justified by the clause in Elizabeth's "Act of Uniformity," empowering the sovereign to "ordain and publish . . . further ceremonies and rites," with the advice of her commissioners, or of the metropolitan, in case the Prayer-book of 1559 should be misused.

We have yet to notice the connection between this conference and the English translation of the Bible published in 1611. There were at this time at least three English Bibles in general use. (1.) The "Great Bible," which first appeared in 1539, and which was sometimes called "Cranmer's Bible," because including a preface by that prelate. This still survived in some of the churches. (2.) The "Genevan Bible" of 1560, which had obtained an immense circulation. Eighty editions had been published between 1568 and 1611. It was undoubtedly the best English translation existent. Its renderings, nowever, sometimes betrayed the animus of the Puritanical party, and this disqualification was still more apparent in its notes. (3.) The "Bishops' Bible" of 1568. This was ill arranged, and, as a translation, was quite unworthy to cope with its rival of Geneva. It had been enjoined, in 1571 and 1587, that all churches should have copies of this Bible, but the clergy betrayed little anxiety about the execution of such orders. At the conference Dr. Reynolds censured certain mis-translations in the current versions. This led the king to express his wish that one version should be everywhere established, "to be done by the best learned in both the universities; after them to be reviewed by the bishops and the chief learned of the Church; from

The Bible of
1611.

Its origin
and his-
tory.

them to be presented to the Privy Council; and, lastly, to be ratified by his royal authority, and so this whole Church to be bound unto it and none other.”¹ Bancroft deprecated the insertion of notes in the new version, and the king admitted that he had noticed in the Genevan Bible “some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits.” This was all that was done at the conference. In July, 1604, we find King James informing Bancroft that he had appointed “certain learned men, to the number of four and fifty, for the translation of the Bible.” Doubtless many of these began their labours at once. But it was not until 1607 that the revision committee met in conference. Death or resignation had then diminished their number to forty-seven. They were divided into six companies, two of which met at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge. Each company had a separate portion of Scripture allotted to it. Each, however, was charged to send every book, when revised, to the other companies, “to be considered of seriously and judiciously.” At the completion of the revision at the three centres, two members were chosen from each company to superintend the final preparation of the work. The new version came out in 1611. Its superiority to the other versions was at once recognized, and gained for it universal acceptance.² The recent canon giving legal status to the “Bishops’ Bible” at once became a dead letter. The new version survived the proposal to supersede it made in the Long Parliament

¹ Barton, *Sum and Substance of the Conference*: see Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences*, pp. 187, 188.

² It was described as “appointed to be read in churches.” But there is no proof that it was ever publicly sanctioned by Convocation, or by Parliament, or by the king in Council. “It gained its currency partly, it may have been, by the weight

in April, 1653, and has since been accepted as "the Bible" in all English-speaking localities. It is only in recent times that a more extended research has forced upon the minds of scholars the necessity of producing a more accurate translation for general use. Whatever its failings as a reproduction of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, the simplicity and rhythmical beauty of its diction will always secure the version of 1611 a high place among English classics. A comparison would probably show that for much of this linguistic beauty we are indebted not so much to the editors of King James's version, as to those of the "Bishops' Bible" and its predecessors. The object of the revisionists, says Dr. Miles Smith in his preface, was not to "make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad a good one, but to make a *good one* better, or out of many good ones one principal good one." The words italicized refer to the "Bishops' Bible" authorized by the Canon of 1604.¹

With the words *pro ecclesiâ Dei* on his lips, Archbishop Whitgift passed away shortly after the close of the Hampton Court Conference. Whitgift claims distinction among the primates as one who presided over

Death of
Whitgift.

of the king's name, partly by the personal authority of the prelates and scholars who had been engaged upon it, but still more by its own intrinsic superiority over its rivals."—Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, p. 153. The "Bishops' Bible" is, strictly speaking, still the only "Authorized Version" of our Church, though this term is often misapplied to the version of 1611.

¹ The following are the most celebrated translations of the Bible:—Wyclif's New Testament, cir. 1380; Old Testament, cir. 1383; Turvey's (a revision of Wyclif's), 1388; Tyndale's printed New Testament, 1525, and Pentateuch, 1530; Coverdale's Bible, 1535; Matthew's Bible (a compilation from Tyndale's and Coverdale's by Matthew Rogers), 1537; the Great Bible (a revision of Matthew's by Coverdale), 1539; Taverner's (also a revision of Matthew's), 1539; the Genevan Bible (by Whittingham and other refugees), 1560; the Bishops' Bible (by Archbishop Parker's committee), 1568; the Douay Bible (a reproduction of Jerome from the Vulgate), 1609–10; the so-called authorized version by King James's translators, 1611. To these we may now add the revision of the New Testament of 1611 issued in May, 1881.

CHAP.
XIII.

our Church at a critical period, and by his energy and courage purged her of abuses within, and protected her from hostility from without. He has been unjustly branded with the character of a bigoted persecutor on account of the severe suppression of the sectarian party during his primacy. Those who bear in mind the dangers with which this party menaced the constitution, the dastardly expedients to which they had recourse in their attempt to spread their tenets, and, above all, the clemency with which Whitgift ever treated a fallen foe, will regard him in another light. In the words of Mr. Perry, "to Whitgift the Church of England owes, under God, the preservation of its order and discipline, and the rescue of its property from the covetous grasp of the queen and courtiers."¹ This is a fair epitome of his work, nor can we find any graver disqualification in this primate than an excusable want of theological attainment.

Bancroft
Archbishop
of Canter-
bury.
Dec. 1640.

Against Bancroft, his successor at Canterbury, may be levelled with more reason those accusations of bigoted zeal for conformity with which Puritan writers have endeavoured to assail the fame of Whitgift. Bancroft was a man of warmer temperament, and he was nominated by James, who now made no secret of his hostility to the Puritans, for the express purpose of suppressing nonconformity with a high hand. Clergymen who had already subscribed Whitgift's three Articles of conformity were compelled to subscribe them again, then to sign a declaration that they subscribed willingly and *ex animo*. Those who refused this test of their purpose in signing were practically in the same position as those who refused conformity altogether, save that they were allowed time to change their minds. These

The ex-
animo test.

¹ Student's English Church History, p. 364.

precautions against insincerity ousted several clergymen from their preferments. According to Bancroft himself, the number amounted to forty-nine, but the computation of Puritan writers raises it to three hundred. Before the installation of Bancroft the way was paved for this stringent policy by Convocation's acceptance of the important code known as the Canons of 1604.

These Canons, though fallen into desuetude, are legally still binding on the clergy, and morally on all professed Churchmen. They are one hundred and sixty-one in number, and are divided into thirteen chapters. The first chapter inveighs against the Puritans, and declares all who affirm that the English Church is not a part of the true and Apostolic Church to be *ipso facto* excommunicated. In Chapter II., which treats of *Divine Worship*, the use of the cross at Baptism, concerning which the Puritans were scrupulous, is defended in a lengthy argument. In the same chapter occur Canons prescribing that the Litany be used on Wednesdays and Fridays; that all make lowly reverence at the name of Jesus; that Holy Communion be received three times a year at the least; and that copes be used in cathedral churches. In the third chapter, that on *Ministers*, occurs the order that Whitgift's three Articles are to be subscribed *ex animo* by all who are ordained, admitted, or licensed. It will be sufficient to enumerate the titles of the remaining chapters. Chapter IV. treats of *Schoolmasters*; Chapter V. of the *Decent Fittings and Ornaments of Churches and their Repair*; Chapter VI. of *Churchwardens and Parish Clerks*; Chapters VII. to XII. of *Ecclesiastical Courts*; and Chapter XIII. of *Synods*. The Canons were compiled by Bancroft himself, from earlier sources. After being accepted by the Convoca-

The Canons
of 1604.

CHAP.
XIII.

tion of Canterbury, they were declared binding on the northern province by royal letters patent. The Convocation of York thereupon asserted its claim to make its own Canons. The claim was allowed, and the Canons were properly passed in the Northern Convocation. Though sanctioned by the king, the Canons were never ratified by Parliament. Legally, therefore, they are only binding on the laity where they are declaratory of previous statutes.

The
Puritan
contro-
versy.

The effect of Bancroft's rigour was to widen the gulf between the High and Low Church parties. Early in 1605 there appeared a Puritan treatise, entitled the "Abridgment of the Lincoln Ministers," in which the ceremonies of the Church were regarded not merely as objectionable, but as sinful. The catalogue of alleged abuses in the Church appended to the "Abridgment" is much larger than that in the "Millenary Petition." Morton, afterwards Bishop of Chester, answered the "Abridgment" in a feeble treatise, called the "Defence of the Three Ceremonies." The three ceremonies were those which were the special grievances of the Puritans, viz. kneeling at Holy Communion, wearing the surplice, and using the sign of the cross at Baptism.

Folly of
Bancroft's
conduct.

The policy of Archbishop Bancroft was so far crowned with success that non-conformity was driven into concealment, and many Puritan clergy sought the company of the Brownists in Holland, and there devoted themselves to religious jangling and mutual excommunications. It has often been said that the primate's conduct was unconstitutional. It must be remembered, however, that it had the sanction of the Star Chamber Court, and that this warrant was in those days legally sufficient. Injudicious, however, it certainly was. The exaltation of the royal prerogative by the enforcement

of a test unsanctioned by Parliament alienated from the Anglican system many to whom the personal liberty of the subject was more dear than religious uniformity. It has been well observed that in the limitations of civil and religious liberty to which the prelates of James's reign lent their sanction lies the explanation of that strange coalition of educated gentlemen and fanatical Puritans which formed the nucleus of the Great Rebellion. Even in Elizabeth's reign the judges had shown much jealousy of the bishops, and had used prohibitions to stay such suits in the ecclesiastical courts as they regarded as falling under their own cognizance. In the present reign the collisions between the secular and ecclesiastical tribunals were continual. In the Parliament of 1610 the High Commission Court was so violently denounced that the House received a rebuke from James himself. The argument of the courtier prelates was that, the judges being only delegates of the king, he could take causes out of their hands, and transfer cognizance of them to such tribunals as the Court of High Commission. Having a sovereign favourable to the Church, they pressed the theory that the king could do no wrong, and that Parliament met not of right, but by the royal sufferance. So plainly were these doctrines expressed in Dr. Cowell's "Interpreter," that, notwithstanding James's recent admonition, the Houses determined to protect themselves by active measures. They accordingly proceeded to imprison the author and suppress the work by proclamation.

The
absolutist
theory.

The Romanists were exposed, in this reign, to the same rigour as the Puritans, but with more show of justice. A plot had been discovered, shortly after the king's accession, which was held to justify the proclama-

Suppres-
sion of
Romanists.

CHAP
XIII.

tions and Parliamentary enactments for the banishment of Roman priests and Jesuits published in 1604. Driven to desperation, the victims of these severities conceived the iniquitous scheme commonly known as the Gunpowder Plot (1605). Four Jesuits, named Greenway, Gerard, Garnet, and Oldcarr, were implicated in this conspiracy. The two last named suffered the fearful penalties of high treason.

The plot inspired the country with a lively detestation of Romanism, and this form of Christianity was henceforth persecuted under the severe statutes passed in the session of 1605-6. It is melancholy to relate that a sacramental test was now introduced as a means of enforcing conformity. The statutes referred to required suspected persons to receive the Sacrament according to the Anglican use at least once a year, under pain of fines, extending to the forfeiture of two-thirds of their incomes. They were also required to take the oath of allegiance renouncing the temporal power of the Pope in England, under pain of incurring a *præmunire*. The recusants were also disqualified from holding office or practising any profession. These severities gave rise to a controversy between the divines of the two Churches. James, to whom theological disputation was the crowning joy of life, took the lead by publishing an "Apology for the Oath of Allegiance." To this Persons and Bellarmine replied. A wordy warfare ensued, the details of which need not be particularized.

Restoration of
episcopacy
in Scotland.

The king's interest in Church matters was expressed in a more commendable manner by an attempt to re-establish Catholic organization in Scotland. The first step towards bringing the distracted religionists of the north into conformity with the Church would neces-

sarily be a restoration of episcopacy. For this the way was to some extent prepared, for titular bishops had been appointed to the ancient sees, and in 1606 the Scotch Parliament had granted to these functionaries the temporalities of their episcopates. The king urged the Presbyterian divines to suffer the nominal episcopate to be converted into a properly consecrated order of bishops. After much pressure, the northern divines agreed to put the bishops in the position of "constant moderators" of the Church assemblies, and to give them the power of excommunicating, inducting, and depriving ministers. Oaths of obedience to them were to be taken by those appointed to benefices. The way was now prepared for giving these officers their true ecclesiastical status by consecrating them as bishops. Spotswood Archbishop of Glasgow, Lamb Bishop of Brechin, and Hamilton Bishop of Galloway, were accordingly invited to England to be consecrated. By a remarkable exercise of discretion, the three were raised to the episcopate *per saltum*, without being re-
 Oct. 1610.
 quired to pass through the intervening grades of deacon and priest. In justification of this, Bancroft had adduced from the early ages the cases of Ambrose, and others who had been raised to the episcopate from the lay estate. In the same spirit of discretion it was agreed that neither of the English archbishops should take part in the consecration,¹ lest the proceeding should be misconstrued by the Scotch, as designed to reduce their Church to subservience. It only remained that conformity of worship should be established in the northern Church by the introduction of a Book of Common Prayer. The General Assembly at Perth voted that
 A.D. 1618.
 such a work should be prepared. National prejudices

¹ The Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester officiated.

CHAP.
XIII.

forbade the introduction of the English Prayer-book, but the five Articles agreed to at this assembly gave promise that the Scotch use would be based on the same lines as that of England. These Articles (1) enjoined kneeling at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; (2) allowed private communion in case of sickness; (3) permitted private baptism in cases of emergency; (4) ordered the exercise of catechizings and confirmations; and (5) enjoined that holy days and festivals should be duly observed. The service book which the Scotch bishops afterwards drew up was approved of by King James, but he considered that it would be impolitic to introduce it until the nation was more prepared for the innovation. This matter was accordingly deferred. Throughout this enterprise it must be admitted that James exhibited singular wisdom. His conduct contrasts forcibly with that of his successor, whose precipitate endeavour to bring the Scotch Church into closer conformity resulted in the "extirpation of prelacy" by the instrument termed the "Solemn League and Covenant." In the distracted period which ensued the episcopal succession was lost. It was restored by the agency of the English hierarchy in 1661.

Bancroft died in November, 1610. The most popular divine and eloquent preacher in the English Church at this time was Bishop Andrewes. It was commonly supposed that he would be appointed as Bancroft's successor. The king's vanity led him to confer the vacant primacy on a man of a very different stamp, Dr. George Abbot, formerly Master of University College, Oxford, and recently made Bishop of London. Abbot was a sour bigot of Calvinistic principles. He had had little or no experience of pastoral work of any kind. But in a preface to a book he had described the king as

Abbot
Archbishop
of Canter-
bury.

“zealous as David, learned as Solomon, religious as Josias,” and so forth. Hence his promotion to the highest place in the English Church. The one satisfactory incident in Abbot’s primacy was his courageous refusal to divorce Lady Francis Howard from the Earl of Essex, that she might marry the king’s dissolute favourite, Lord Rochester, a refusal which impaired his influence with the king till the end of the reign. The new primate undid the disciplinary work of Bancroft and Whitgift by giving encouragement to the Puritan irregularities of practice. On the other hand, he was as intolerant of error in religious opinion as Calvin himself. This primacy is disgracefully memorable as an era of persecution, for Abbot revived the hateful policy of the Marian times by encouraging the king to punish heresy with death. James, cruel by nature, lent a ready ear to the gloomy Calvinist. To the consternation of his subjects, he issued a writ *de hæretico comburendo* to exterminate an ignorant Unitarian, named Bartholomew Legate, whom he had failed to confute by argument. This execution was shortly followed by another at Lichfield, the victim being Edward Wightman. The capital punishment of heretics as such had been unknown for nearly thirty years; for Elizabeth’s victims had mostly suffered as traitors, not for their religious opinions. Great indignation was therefore excited by these cruelties. The king did not dare again inflict capital punishment for religious error, but contented himself with consigning such offenders to perpetual imprisonment.

Two
heretics
burnt.

March and
April, 1612.

The Church was now hopelessly committed to the cause of arbitrary government, and was incurring such odium that patriotism and Puritanism gradually became synonymous. The political attitude of the prelates of

The
bishops
and
absolutist
principles.

CHAP.
XIII.

this period was a natural consequence of the Reformation settlement. The bishops, who in former ages had been the champions of liberty and the vindicators of the rights of the people, were now entirely dependent on the Crown. In too many cases promotion was secured by truckling, and the favoured ecclesiastic kept his footing at court by arguing from the pulpit and in the House of Lords in behalf of absolute monarchy. The Commons were not slow to express their intolerance of such doctrines, and the divine right of kings frequently received scant consideration from the judges. Neill, Bishop of London, who had argued before the Lords in favour of "impositions" as a royal privilege, was compelled to apologize humbly before the Lower House. The king's unrighteous claim to grant *commendams* to his episcopal favourites (*i.e.*, to give them supplementary pieces of preferment to be held *in commendam* with their sees) was the subject of a suit which came before Sir Edward Coke. The judge incurred suspension and dismissal rather than unjustly quash the trial in deference to James's mandate. How unworthy of their high office were some of James's bishops was shown in the celebrated case of Lady Essex. Two bishops were found who were ready to pronounce the sentence of divorce refused by Abbot. On the lower clergy lay the double burden of oppression from their bishops, and increasing unpopularity with the political reformers. Political independence was for them impossible, and they were compelled to bear the odium of a despotism which pressed, probably, more severely on them than others. The poverty of the clergy was such as to degrade them to the social level of small tradesmen and gentlemen's servants. What protection they received from the State may be guessed from the case of

Unfortunate
position of
the inferior
clergy.

the Rev. E. Peacham, a Somersetshire rector. Peacham had refused to contribute to a "benevolence" demanded of the clergy. He was put in prison on suspicion, and when his house was searched, a sermon alleged to be of a treasonable character was found there. The wretched man was examined under torture, and was condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, though the sermon had never been preached. He escaped the execution of this sentence by dying in prison.

The king was, as we have shown, in most respects opposed to the Puritan party. He was especially averse to their sabbatarian notions, and himself published a "Book of Sports" for Sunday afternoons. Trask, a Puritan minister who ventured to defend the sabbatarian opinions of his party, was promptly set in the pillory, and thence whipped to the Fleet. Of Calvinism, on the other hand, the royal eclectic was, for a time at least, a vehement supporter. When the Synod of Dort was convened in 1618, to settle the dispute between the Calvinists and the Arminians, James, on his own responsibility, sent delegates like-minded with himself. The persons sent were Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff; Hall, afterwards Bishop of Exeter; Ward and Davenant, heads of colleges in Cambridge; and, to represent the Scotch Church, Balcanqual, fellow of Pembroke Hall. The discussion, which resulted in the defeat of the Arminians, bore on the five prominent "points" of Calvinism, and is therefore known as the Quinquarticular controversy. The five Calvinistic degrees were these—(1) Predestination of some to life eternal and others to damnation; (2) Particular Redemption, *i.e.* the theory that Christ died only for a chosen few; (3) Original Sin, as involving the total corruption of human nature; (4) Irresistible Grace, or

The king's
"Book of
Sports."
A.D. 1618.

CHAP.
XIII.

the theory that divine grace overpowers the free-will of God's chosen; (5) Final Perseverance of all who are converted.

The king
turns on
the
Calvinists.

A few years later, political considerations induced the king to modify his Calvinism, to show indulgence to the Arminian platform, and even to extend toleration to the Romanists. It was now ordered that no preacher, under the rank of bishop or dean, should discuss the subjects of predestination, election, and divine grace. None was to rail from the pulpit against Puritans and papists. A proclamation was issued ordering the release of such Roman recusants as were confined in prison. The secret of this change was that James was bent on effecting a marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta of Spain, and desired the good opinion of the Roman Catholics abroad. The residence of a Roman bishop *in partibus* was actually sanctioned. This concession was as uncalled for by the Papists, as it was offensive to Anglicans, since the Jesuits, from *esprit de corps*, preferred the rule of their own arch-priest. Great excitement was caused by the change of policy, and Archbishop Abbot addressed a warm remonstrance to the king for thus "labouring to set up the most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome." Much to the satisfaction of the nation, the Spanish match was broken off. Scarcely less unpopular, however, was the prince's subsequent engagement to another Romanist lady, Henrietta of France.

King James died on March 27, 1625. Though really attached to the Church of England, his influence had been generally detrimental to her interests. In the character of supreme governor of the Church he had persecuted, from time to time, almost all forms of religious opinion. By filling the episcopate with the

partizans of absolutism he had alienated from the Church the sympathies of patriotic citizens. He had allowed his favourites and flatterers to accumulate pluralities, while nothing was done to raise the inferior clergy from a condition of abject poverty. His unfortunate appointment of Abbot to the primacy has been sufficiently noticed. Great excitement was caused among the lawyers by James's promotion of Dean Williams to the office of lord keeper, now usually filled by a layman, and vacated by the fall of the great Lord Bacon. Williams, however, proved himself better qualified to fill the office of lord keeper than to bear that load of clerical honours which made him what Heylin calls "a perfect diocese in himself." Not content with receiving the bishopric of Lincoln, Williams coveted the primacy, and sought to bring about the downfall of Archbishop Abbot in rather a singular manner. The archbishop had accidentally shot one of his keepers with his cross-bow, and Williams urged that the homicide constituted an irregularity and consequent unfitness for the primacy. It was in great measure owing to the advocacy of Bishop Andrewes that Abbot escaped deposition on this singular charge.

CHAP.

XIII.

Lord
Keeper
Williams.
A.D. 1651.

His
attempt to
oust Abbot
from the
primacy.

CHAPTER XIV.

Charles I.

A.D. 1625-1649.

A political reformation imminent—The ecclesiastics are pledged to conservatism—Dread of Romanism—Charles's ecclesiastical policy—Laud practically primate—Dr. Mountague's writings—Abbot now opposed to absolutism—Subservient attitude of Mainwaring and other divines—The "Declaration" attached to the Articles—Intolerance of the Commons—The "Vow" voted—Suspension of Parliament—Laud and Strafford—Courts of High Commission and Star Chamber—Severities of Star Chamber exaggerated—Laud not responsible for these—But for the religious alterations—Laud's reformation of abuses—Laud protects the Holy Tables from desecration—And discountenances extemporary prayers and slovenly services—Laud falsely charged with Romanist opinions—Laud requires the foreign refugees to conform—The sabbatarian controversy—Arbitrary proceedings on both sides—The war with Scotland—Provoked by precipitate religious changes—The Stony Sabbath—The Solemn League and Covenant—The Short Parliament—The Convocation—The Puritans take exception to the sixth Canon—The Long Parliament—Its attack on the High Church clergy—The visitation of churches—The Committee of Religion—Assault on episcopacy—The spiritual lords are mobbed—And imprisoned—Inconsistency of King Charles—The civil war—The "Root and Branch Bill"—The Covenant accepted by the Commons—And by the Westminster Assembly—And enforced on all adults—The Directory of Public Worship—Use of the Prayer-book proscribed—The Presbyterian system—Dissolution of the Westminster Assembly—Archbishop Laud unfairly tried—And done to death—Charles refuses to sacrifice the Church—And is executed—The persecution of the Church—The Committees for Scandalous Ministers—The Committee for Plundered Ministers—The Covenant forced upon the clergy—Terrible sufferings of the clergy—Fate of the bishops—Of the churches—Of the universities.

A political
reforma-
tion
imminent.

LONG before the reign of James, men had perceived that absolutism was out of date, and that it was time for Parliament to take the place of the royal Council. The insurrection of the Lollard socialists, the Wars of the Roses, the reigns of the strong-willed Tudors, the

Reformation with its transfer of papal prerogatives to the sovereign, had all conduced to defer the day of political reform. Before the end of Elizabeth's reign, those theories of personal liberty which had been germinating since the time of Magna Charta, had sufficiently ripened to augur a speedy alteration in the system of government. James endeavoured to prop up the tottering structure of autocracy by means of the Church. The bishops were to be backed up against the Puritans on condition they guarded the throne against the encroachments of Parliament. In return for enjoying the rule of a good Churchman the clergy were to preach the divine right of kings. The natural result of this alliance was that the Commons coquetted with the sects, and at last became Puritanical on political grounds, this semblance of Puritanism becoming more and more a real sectarian animus as the Church waned in popularity. A collision, in which Church and throne would share one fate, could only have been averted by the accession of a consummate diplomatist such as Elizabeth, or the promotion of a patriot primate such as Becket. Neither of these contingencies occurred. The successor to James was a man of amiable disposition and virtuous life, but utterly devoid of political ability, and educated in a belief that the English sovereign reigned as God's sole viceroy like a king in ancient Israel. The administration of the Church fell into the hands of a prelate whose many talents were made subsidiary to the cause of absolutism. The fated transition was accordingly inaugurated by a rebellion, in which the principles of the Church were proscribed, her clergy persecuted with fearful severity, and her temples wrecked by spiteful and triumphant fanatics.

The
ecclesiastics
are
pledged to
conserva-
tism.

CHAP.
XIV.

Dread of
Romanism.

July 8,
1625.

Dec. 15.

Charles's
ecclesiastical
policy.

The reign opened badly with the marriage of Charles to an uncompromising Romanist, Henrietta Maria of France, and the consequent importation of a retinue of foreign priests, whose presence aggrieved the Puritans, and was a violation of the statutes against recusants. A secret engagement had been made at the close of the last reign between James, Charles, and the Pope, that this alliance should bring concessions to the Romanists in England. But the nation was in no mood to grant such indulgences. The Commons consisted of men who hated popery, and were learning to distrust prelacy. It presented to the king a pious petition, praying for the execution of the laws against Roman missionaries and recusants. Charles endeavoured to satisfy the petitioners by issuing royal letters to the archbishops, requiring them to neglect no good means "for finding out and apprehending of Jesuits and seminary priests, and other seducers of his people to the Romish religion, or for repressing popish recusants." But these letters he practically cancelled by secret dispensations.

In his theological opinions Charles was quite unlike his father. He was a pronounced and consistent Churchman, zealous in the interests of Anglicanism, but without intellectual ability to tolerate other systems, least of all the Calvinistic school now popular among the English laity. Abbot had lost favour at court before the death of James. After Charles's accession he was practically no longer primate. The pluralist Williams was equally out of favour. He had fostered the popular hostility against Buckingham, and had taken part in intrigues discreditable to his clerical profession. He was deprived of the Great Seal, and sank into obscurity. He was subsequently tried for subornation of perjury, fined £10,000, and imprisoned.

Andrewes, in all respects the most distinguished divine of his day, was probably too moderate a man for Charles. From the first the sun of royal favour shone full on William Laud, Bishop of S. David's. Laud had been president of S. John's College, Oxford, chaplain to King James, and Dean of Gloucester. He became a bishop in 1621. He was regarded with real affection by Buckingham, but seems not to have been much in favour with James. With the public he was unpopular, as having been involved in the secret scheme for marrying Charles to the Infanta. Charles had for some time honoured him with his intimacy. Henceforth in matters ecclesiastical he was paramount. Laud was appointed to act as dean at the coronation. The ceremonial employed on this occasion was offensive to the Puritans, and was subsequently alluded to by Prynne in his indictment of Laud. A crucifix was displayed on the altar, and an ancient prayer was resuscitated to illustrate the sacred character of the sovereign's office. Before the coronation, Charles, ignoring the authority of the Primate Abbot, had directed Laud to consult with Andrewes about the business of Convocation. Here Laud's impetuosity and want of discretion had been sufficiently displayed, for he had counselled that the burning questions of the Synod of Dort should be brought forward, and the Calvinistic formulae be rejected by Convocation. The influence of Andrewes prevented this injudicious proceeding.

CHAP.
XIV.

Laud
practically
primate.

The temper of the nation at this time would have taxed the abilities of wiser rulers than Charles. The deference of the bishops to absolutist policy and the revived dread of Romanism had excited such sympathy with the Puritan and Calvinistic party, that

CHAP.
XIV.Dr. Mountague's
writings.

"No Arminianism" was as popular a cry as "No popery." The Mountague case well illustrates the prevalent religious prejudice. Dr. Mountague, Rector of Stamford Rivers, had lately written against certain proselytizing Jesuits. His "New Gagg for an Old Goose," showing that the Calvinistic tenets they imputed to the Church of England were not its doctrines, had been censured by Archbishop Abbot. Urged on by Laud, Mountague had answered his censor in a work of similar tendency, but more strongly worded, entitled "Appello Cæsarem." The Commons of Charles's first Parliament took it upon themselves to examine this production, censure it as not agreeing with the Synod of Dort, and require Mountague to find bail of £2000 for his appearance at their bar in the next session. Laud interceded for Mountague with the king, on the reasonable ground that some of the impugned opinions were "the resolved doctrine of the Church of England," and others such as were fit for learned men to view as they chose. The king intimated to the House that what had been there said and resolved in Mountague's cause was displeasing to him. But in this and other matters Parliament remained uncompromising. The second Parliament renewed the attack on Mountague, determined that the "Appello Cæsarem" was "dishonourable to the late king, to many worthy divines, and to other reformed Churches beyond the seas," and prayed that the author should be punished according to his demerits, and the book suppressed and burnt. The king, however, by a proclamation acquitted his chaplain. The animus of the House was diverted to the case of Buckingham, whose maladministration was made a pretext for refusing supply. To save Buckingham, Charles dissolved the

June 14,
1626.

second Parliament. Mountague incurred no further persecution, and Charles was injudicious enough to make him Bishop of Chichester soon afterwards.

CHAP.

XIV.

The levying of tunnage and poundage without authority of Parliament had already been denounced in the Commons. Charles, however, to raise the subsidies which he could not get from Parliament, was induced not only to continue this questionable exaction, but to raise a forced loan by virtue of the royal prerogative. For refusing to lend, seventy-eight gentlemen were imprisoned by the Privy Council. The Church was persuaded to compromise itself by abetting these proceedings, and the pulpits rang with arguments for royal prerogative. It is creditable to Archbishop Abbot that he incurred disgrace for refusing to make his high office the tool of absolutism. A sermon of little merit had been preached by Dr. Sibthorpe at Northampton Assizes, in which it was laid down that the king had power *jure divino* to make laws and impose taxes. Buckingham, with the royal sanction, sent this sermon to Lambeth, to be printed by archiepiscopal authority. Abbot refused his imprimatur, urging that several statements in the sermon were likely to give offence, and that its inferences with reference to the customary allegiance of subjects would not stand, seeing that the loan had "neither law nor custom for it." For this he was put, like Elizabeth's archbishop, Grindal, in a state of quasi-suspension, being compelled to retire to his country house for a time.

Abbot now
opposed to
absolutism.

In making Laund practically superior to the primate Charles had at all events honoured a man of real talent, and one whose rule was mainly to the advantage of the Church. But many of the divines whom Charles

CHAP.
XIV.

Subser-
vient atti-
tude of
Main-
waring
and other
divines.

A.D. 1628.

promoted were men of little merit, and the common stepping-stone to preferment was belief in royal prerogative. The case of Dr. Mainwaring illustrates the king's principle of action. This divine had preached that "justice intervenes not between prince and people, . . . for justice is between equals;" that his royal will in imposing loans and taxes, though without the consent of Parliament, "must be obeyed under penalty of eternal damnation." When Charles summoned his third Parliament, Mainwaring was condemned in both Houses for these statements, and sentenced by the lords to imprisonment, a fine, and three years' suspension. He escaped, however, with a brief incarceration and the disgrace of tendering an abject submission to the Houses. Mainwaring became at once the object of royal favour, and, after Laud's translation, was preferred to S. David's.

The
"Declara-
tion"
attached
to the
Articles.

In retaliation for pulpit politics came another outburst of House of Commons theology. Laud was of opinion that there would be no chance of peace while the predestinarian dispute was permitted to rage. He therefore caused the Thirty-nine Articles to be reprinted, with a "Declaration" from the king deprecating the strife between Calvinists and Arminians, limiting preachers to the simple and grammatical interpretation of the Articles, and declaring that Convocation was the proper place for the settlement of disputed points of doctrine or discipline. Such a tolerant treatment of the question at issue was not to the mind of the Puritan faction. Dr. Lingard well observes that these men, if the champions of civil, were the fiercest enemies of religious freedom. They were as determined to bring the Church under the bondage of Calvinism as they were to resist the king's encroachments on the

Intolerance
of the
Commons.

liberties of the subject. The imaginary horrors of Arminianism and the real grievance of enforced taxation were associated in all their jeremiads. The "Declaration" was assailed by Mr. Rouse, afterwards Speaker, who argued that "an Arminian was the spawn of a papist," and by Mr. Pym, who declared, and probably believed, that the Lambeth Articles had been acknowledged to be the doctrine of the Church. The last-named member declared his conviction that Parliament was the proper body "to establish true religion," and that Convocations were bodies "of small importance." In deference to such arguments the Commons voted the "Vow," in which they "claimed, protested, and avowed for truth" the Calvinistic sense of the Articles, adding that "we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians and all others, wherein they differ from us."

The
"Vow"
voted.

The third Parliament continued uncompromising and unmanageable, notwithstanding concessions on the part of the king. Charles had released the seventy-eight gentlemen imprisoned for refusing the forced loan. He had thrown a sop to Abbot, recently readmitted at court, by encouraging him to hold a convocation of selected clergymen to devise means for repressing popery. He even gave unqualified assent to the "Petition of Right." The House, however, still clamoured about tunnage and poundage, as well as about Laud's proceedings in restoring decent worship and suppressing Puritan irreverence. In these, as in other proceedings of this primate, an excellent intention was disparaged by a harsh and arbitrary manner of action. Matters were brought to a climax by Hollis's three resolutions: that whosoever should seek to bring in Arminianism or other "innovations" in religion—or advise or aid the taking of tunnage and poundage—or pay the same

CHAP.
XIV.

Suspension
of Parlia-
ments.
A.D. 1629.

Laud and
Strafford.

—should be accounted a capital enemy to the kingdom. For their share in the disorderly debate which ensued, Eliot, Hollis, and others were fined and imprisoned. The king dissolved his third Parliament, and governed without Parliamentary advice for the eleven years following.

The chief ministers during this period were Laud and Thomas Wentworth, who had been won over from the ranks of the opposition and raised to the peerage as Lord Strafford. It is plain that both advocated principles which we should now call unconstitutional, and that both were disciplinarians who did not hesitate to punish offenders with sentences severe, and in modern estimation barbarous. How far such principles and such sentences were reprehensible in those days is by no means so manifest. Both ministers were honest, kind-hearted men, estimable in private life; both were devout Christians. We shall not err, perhaps, if we impute to such men no greater fault than inability to read the signs of the times.

Courts of
High Com-
mission
and Star
Chamber.

The most unpopular, and perhaps most reprehensible, part of Charles's system was the active employment of the High Commission and Star Chamber Courts. The former, as we have seen, had been established in 1559, to represent the jurisdiction of royalty in matters ecclesiastical. To suppress religious disorder, the commissioners had been ceded powers of wide scope, and such as might easily be abused. The encroachments of this court on the province of the lay judges have already been noticed. The Star Chamber Court was of more ancient origin. As at present constituted it had the sanction of an Act of Parliament passed in 1487. Its province had been to take cognizance of divers misdemeanours which it was thought could not be satis-

factorily disposed of by an ordinary jury. Its members, according to the arrangement of 1487, were the chancellor, treasurer, privy seal, two judges, and one lay and one spiritual lord of the Council. In such a body the king's influence would naturally be paramount, and the Star Chamber had frequently been used as an engine of royal oppression. Charles, on the Commons refusing his unreasonable demand for subsidies, raised money by questionable expedients, and those who made resistance were informed against and sentenced in the Star Chamber. Charles's Star Chamber was severe in its sentences, but the cases commonly cited do not exhibit it as more severe than other courts in the preceding reigns. Dr. Sherfield, recorder of Salisbury, was deprived, imprisoned, and fined £500 for smashing the stained window of a church in a fit of iconoclastic zeal. The judges of Elizabeth's reign would not have treated him less severely. The foul libellers Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton¹ were sentenced to be fined and imprisoned, to lose their ears and be exposed in the pillory. Dr. Leighton, who reviled the queen and the bishops in terms as strong as can be conceived, was sentenced to be publicly whipped and branded, and

CHAP.
XIV.

Severities
of Star
Chamber
exagger-
ated.

¹ The most notorious of the libellers, Prynne the lawyer, was as voluminous as scurrilous. The immediate cause of his troubles was a lengthy work called the *Histrio-mastix*, in which he inveighed against the queen's predilection for dancing and theatrical exhibitions. He was summoned before the Star Chamber for fresh libels in 1637. The productions of the libellers were chiefly remarkable for their strong flavour. In *Zion's Plea against Prelates*, by Dr. Leighton, the bishops are "men of blood," "enemies to God and the State;" the Church is "antichristian and satanical;" the queen "a Canaanite, a daughter of Heth, and an idolatress." Felton, the assassin of Buckingham, is the subject of eulogy. Bastwick, a physician by profession, had published a work in which he reviled the bishops as "worse than the devil, rook-catchers, soul-murderers, hirelings, a commonwealth of rats." According to Burton, who was a schoolmaster or tutor in Holy Orders, his episcopal superiors are "limbs of the beast, even Antichrist," "false prophets," "ravening wolves, factors for Antichrist, antichristian mushrumps." He closes his parody on the Litany with the words, "From plague, pestilence, and famine, from bishops, priests, and deacons, good Lord, deliver us."

CHAP.
XIV.

to have his ears cut off and his nostrils slit. Such was the barbarous manner of treating criminals for years afterwards. Under Elizabeth the libellers would have certainly forfeited their lives. When the Puritan faction wished to inaugurate their triumph with the sacrifice of a prelate, the blame of all the Star Chamber proceedings was thrown on Archbishop Laud, and modern writers of the same theological school have tried to represent this primate as delighting in persecution. As a fact Laud's influence in the Star Chamber was not greater than that of the other members, and in the trials of the libellers he appears to have taken no part.

Laud not
responsible
for these,

But for the
religious
alterations.

On the other hand, for those proceedings in Church matters which the Puritans stigmatized as "innovations" in religion, Laud may be considered exclusively responsible. These proceedings will be noticed in detail. It must be premised that the theory of absolutism entertained by Charles and Laud extended to ecclesiastical as well as civil matters, so that the rights of Convocation were as plainly disregarded now as in the days of Henry and Edward. Laud might have been styled Charles's vicar-general. "The clergy were simply ordered to carry out the royal will. The king censures bishops for their sermons, ordains by his sole will a body of Canons for Scotland, even sets forth a declaration to interpret the Articles of Religion. For these illegal acts Laud was responsible as ecclesiastical adviser, but the clergy, no less than himself, had to pay the penalty."¹

In 1628 Laud had been made Bishop of London. He succeeded to the primacy when it was vacated by the death of Abbot in 1633. Practically, however, he had been at the head of ecclesiastical affairs since the

¹ Perry, *Student's English Church History*, p. 415.

beginning of the reign. The influence of the favoured prelate is apparent in the "Instructions" to the bishops published by the king in 1629. This document, if of questionable authority, is undeniably commendable in its object—the reformation of ecclesiastical abuses and the establishment of a decent and orderly ritual. The bishop is to reside in his diocese, and not injure the estates of the see by cutting down timber and granting leases detrimental to his successors. The office of lecturer or preaching curate is to be more strictly controlled; divine service is to be read before the lecture, and the preacher is to wear a gown and not a cloak. In the afternoon catechizing is to take the place of the sermon. The ministry being discredited by a host of private chaplains who were exempt from diocesan control, it is ordered that chaplains should be kept only by noblemen and certain high officials. These directions would necessarily rouse the hostility of four classes—the non-resident bishops, the puritanical lecturers, the secularized chaplains, and the country gentlemen who employed them. A less justifiable proceeding was the suppression of the "Collectors of S. Antholin's," a corporation formed for the purpose of filling the livings with Puritans. This society was dissolved by an order of the Court of Exchequer in 1633, and the livings which it had bought in lapsed to the Crown.

Equally open to censure, however commendable in intention, were Laud's provisions with regard to the Sacrament of the Altar. It will be remembered that Edward's Council had adopted Ridley's innovation, and ordered the removal of the Holy Tables into the middle of the chancels. The innovation had been treated hitherto in the spirit of compromise. Elizabeth's

CHAP.
XIV.

Laud's
reforma-
tion of
abuses.

Laud
protects
the Holy
Tables from
desecra-
tion.

CHAP.
XIV.

A.D. 1634.

"Injunctions," though ordering that the Holy Table was to stand altar-wise against the east wall when not in use, allowed it to be placed in the body of the chancel in an east and west direction when Holy Communion was administered. In some of the churches this appears to have become its permanent position. This usage was undoubtedly conducive to irreverence and to disparagement of the Church's holiest rite. The churchwarden was wont to use the Holy Table when making entries in his account book; the congregation made it a depository for their hats and cloaks; it was even used as a post of vantage from which to hear the sermon. In the case of S. Nicholas' Church, Abingdon, which had come before the Court of Chancery in 1628, it had been ruled that the Holy Table should remain "constantly at the upper end of the chancel." An order to the same effect was given by the Council with respect to S. Gregory's Church, London. By his authority as primate, Laud issued an order that the Holy Table should everywhere rest altar-wise against the east wall, and that it should be fenced off by rails from the body of the chancel. Since Laud's arrangement now obtains in all our churches, we can gratefully acknowledge his services in thus providing against Puritan irreverence and misconception of the Church's means of grace. The informality of the primate's procedure is, however, much to be regretted. The episcopate—if we except Williams, who resisted from mere captiousness—were sufficiently willing to execute the order of their metropolitan. But the Puritans, of course, discovered popery in Laud's decent provision. Disobedience, however, was not tolerated. Here and there churchwardens were excommunicated or imprisoned for resisting the order. Many clergymen appear to have

been suspended for the same cause, especially in the Norwich diocese, the head-quarters of Puritanism.

CHAP.
XIV.

The primate also gave orders that ministers should confine themselves to the Prayer-book, and discontinue the practice of using extemporary prayers in the pulpit. Puritan ministers had been wont to interlard these extemporary effusions with Calvinistic or political shibboleths. That the people might learn to value reverent worship Laud prescribed greater care for the accessories of divine service. Provision was in some places made for ornate services, such as offered a startling contrast to the slovenly "kneeless" cult affected by the Puritans. In his own cathedral Laud enjoined that the members of the chapter should bow to the altar at their coming in and going out of the choir. In many cathedrals and episcopal chapels the use of the cope was revived. Churches were everywhere restored and beautified.

And dis-
counte-
nances
extem-
porary
prayers
and
slovenly
services.

From the ultra-Protestant party, who saw Romanism in the doctrines of Van Harmin, Laud's useful labours of course elicited a "No popery" cry. The author of the "Conference with Fisher," the champion of Anglicanism whom every papist admitted to be the greatest enemy of Rome in England, hardly needs to be vindicated of a charge which merely testified to the ignorance or rancour of the Puritan faction. Laud's noble refutation of this charge of Romish proclivity, when it was brought forward at his trial, deserves, however, to be quoted. "I have converted," said he, "several from popery; I have taken an oath against it; I have written a book against it; I have held a controversy against it; I have been twice offered a cardinal's hat and refused it;¹ I have been twice in danger of my life from a

Laud
falsely
charged
with
Romanist
opinions.

¹ On two occasions in 1633 a person came secretly to Laud, and, premising that he acted with the consent of the Roman court, offered him a cardinal's hat. Laud

CHAP.
XIV.

Laud
requires
the
foreign
refugees
to conform.

popish plot; I have endeavoured to reconcile the Lutherans and Calvinists; and therefore I have endeavoured to introduce popery."

The congregations of foreign Protestants had obtained toleration from Elizabeth, on the plea that they knew not sufficient English to join in the services of the Church. Laud withdrew this concession, and bade these privileged worshippers conform to the Church of the English nation or experience the disabilities consequent on excommunication. His conduct in this matter appears at first sight rather harsh. But it could not be expected that these aliens should enjoy in perpetuity religious liberties which were as yet refused to native non-conformity. Laud argued that most of the foreigners were practically Englishmen, because able to conduct business transactions in English. They must therefore be subject to the same laws as Englishmen. Those who were really ignorant of English he allowed to use a translation of our Liturgy.

The
sabbatarian
controversy.

It will be remembered that the sabbatarian controversy had widened the breach between Churchmen and Puritans in James's reign. The Church divines desired such an observance of the Sunday as obtains at the present time among most European nations. When men were not engaged in worship, they were to recreate themselves. Recreation, in an age when the lower classes could not read or write, took the form of bodily exercise. Such amusements therefore as bowling, dancing, drilling, etc., had been allowed not only by the English divines, but by Calvin, Luther, and the continental Protestants. The Puritan theory, which of course declined it. The notion of there being a Protestant cardinal was then common. But it is more probable that the offer was made by some foe who wished to give a handle to Puritan or Romanist hostility.

converted the day of gladness into a day of gloom, originated with the Dutch Anabaptists, and was probably exaggerated to accredit pretensions to extraordinary sanctity, and to gratify a love of dissidence. The Puritans at this time preached that Sunday recreation was a deadly sin. Chief Justice Richardson, when attending the assizes in Somersetshire, had taken upon himself not only to prohibit all Sunday diversions, but to direct that the prohibition should be published by every clergyman in his parish church on certain specified Sundays. Laud administered a severe rebuke to this officious judge, and enforced the Church view of the question by a procedure almost equally indefensible. James's "Book of Sports" was republished. To it was attached a notice which not only intimated King Charles's wish for the continuance of Sunday sports, and instructed the justices to see that they were conducted in an orderly manner and without interference, but also directed the clergy to publish the royal intimation in their churches. The issue of such a direction at a time when party feeling ran high was most impolitic. Laud is charged with the graver offence of punishing, by fine or imprisonment, certain clergymen who, on conscientious grounds, refused compliance.

CHAP.
XIV.

Arbitrary
proceed-
ings on
both sides.

As no Parliament existed, the unpopularity of their proceedings was not appreciated by the Council. It was not till the war with Scotland compelled Charles to summon a Parliament that public feeling found an outlet. The war itself was connected with religious changes. James had introduced episcopacy into Scotland with all care to avoid offence. But the jealousy of the Presbyterian divines was roused, and only sought a pretext. In Charles's reign it was easy

The war
with
Scotland
A.D. 1640.

CHAP.
XIV.

Provoked
by pre-
cipitate
religious
changes.
A.D. 1633.

The "Stony
Sabbath."
July, 1637.

The
"Solemn
League and
Covenant."

to asperse the bishops as enemies to liberty. The nobility and gentry of Scotland found less difficulty in crediting such charges when Charles injudiciously admitted that he wished to restore the lay impropriations to the Scotch Church. The king was warned by the Scotch bishops that such a scheme would be impracticable. They were then requested to prepare a distinct Liturgy for Scotland, which it was hoped might be more acceptable. Charles, however, cut the ground from under their feet by drawing up a body of Canons for the northern Church without consulting the Scotch clergy, and sending it for their acceptance on his own authority. This proceeding caused much dissatisfaction, especially as the Canons were of a High Church and absolutist tendency. The Scotch Liturgy was reviewed by Laud, Wren, and Juxon, and, having been ratified by the king, was appointed to be used at Easter, 1635. Its first appearance was, however, delayed till July. This procrastination was naturally attributed by the antagonistic party to timidity. Under such auspices it is not surprising that the introduction of the Prayer-book did not commend itself to the people of the north. At its first reading in Edinburgh Cathedral, on the celebrated "Stony Sabbath," a riot was raised, the bishop and other ecclesiastics being pelted with whatever missiles came first to hand. The agitation was not ephemeral. A Puritan organization had been busy throughout the country disseminating false ideas about the Prayer-book and the episcopal system, and now a representative committee drew up the celebrated document called the "Solemn League and Covenant." By this they pledged themselves to effect, "without respect of persons, the extirpation of prelacy; that is, Church government by archbishops,

bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy." This work of extirpation was to be carried out in England and Ireland, as well as in Scotland. The Marquis of Hamilton was sent to Edinburgh to restore harmony, but the insurgents would not hear of compromise. They clamoured for a "General Assembly." The request was allowed, and the Assembly proceeded to abolish episcopacy, excommunicate those who favoured it, condemn the Liturgy and Canons, and denounce Arminianism as antichristian. A bloody persecution of episcopalians, or "malignants," followed.

CHAP.
XIV.

The king, compelled to make war, saw that he must get subsidies by summoning a Parliament. The new House, however, though orderly in point of behaviour, pertinaciously refused to treat of supply. A Puritan majority clamoured for the immediate appointment of a committee for religion. Laud's concession that the committee should consist of members of Convocation and members of Parliament in equal numbers was scornfully rejected. Mr. Pym made a long speech, complaining of the introduction of "those superstitious and infirm ceremonies which accompanied the most decrepit age of popery." Altars, bowing towards the east, pictures, crosses, crucifixes, were the special subject of his complaint. With more show of reason he denounced the punishment of ministers for not reading the king's proclamation attached to the "Book of Sports," and the encroachments of the High Commission and the ecclesiastical courts. In similar strains spoke other Puritan members, the upshot being that the House would not consider the question of "supply" till these grievances were redressed. The

The "Short
Parliament."
April, 1640.

CHAP.
XIV.

House of Lords conferred with the Commons, and urged compliance with the king's wishes, but the majority continued refractory. They declared that they would not allow Canons to be passed in Convocation without consent of Parliament, and they detailed seven special grievances:—(1.) The licensing of “popish” books. (2.) Setting the Holy Table altar-wise. (3.) Setting up crosses, images, and crucifixes in cathedrals, churches, and chapels. (4.) Refusing to administer Holy Communion except at the altar rails. (5.) Enforcement of articles of inquiry at episcopal visitations. (6.) Molesting and depriving godly ministers for not reading the “Book of Sports.” (7.) Enjoining obeisance to the altar. The king, finding the House impervious to persuasion, followed the advice of Sir Henry Vane and dissolved the “Short Parliament.”

The Con-
vocation.

According to the usual custom Convocation should have been dissolved when Parliament expired. Laud, however, wished to secure subsidies from the clergy, and to legalize the recently impugned “innovations” by *ex post facto* Canons. The anomaly of continuing the sessions of Convocation was justified by opinions given by the Lord Chancellor and six judges; and to be quite safe Laud secured a new writ, summoning the clergy to sit in *synod*. The synod was full of loyalty. It voted the required subsidy for the Scotch war, and resolved that every minister should preach once a quarter on the divine right of kings and on the royal prerogatives. One of the Canons of this synod justified Laud's proceedings with reference to the position and enclosure of the altars. Reception at the altar rail and obeisance to the altar are also enjoined by this Canon. By the sixth Canon a new oath of allegiance to the doctrine, discipline, and government of

The
Puritans

the Church was to be demanded of the clergy. There was nothing extraordinary in such a demand, seeing that the Scotch had pledged themselves in the Covenant to extirpate prelacy in England. In fact, the form of the oath was borrowed from the Covenant. An unimportant informality, however, in the wording of this test gave a vantage ground to the unscrupulous foe. The oath concluded with the words, "nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, *et cætera*, as it stands now established." *Et cætera* was merely an abbreviation in the draft for "chancellors, commissaries, officials, and such like." The substitution of these words in the printed copy was inadvertently neglected. The Puritans at once attached an insidious meaning to the *et cætera* oath. From all parts of the country it was protested against. The people were taught to believe that the bishops had some secret design against their liberties. Already there had been riots in the precincts of Lambeth and Westminster. Now a mob invaded the High Commission Court sitting at St. Paul's, with the cry, "No bishop! no High Commission!"

At the close of the year 1640 the successes of the Scotch compelled Charles to listen to the popular demand for a Parliament. The body returned was the notorious "Long Parliament," which met on November 3 of this year, and was not dissolved till March, 1660. The peers at York, meanwhile, concluded a truce with the invaders. By the treaty of Ripon it was arranged that hostilities should cease, and the Scotch army be supported till the points of grievance should be settled by the Parliaments of the two countries. In the new Commons denunciations of the bishops and complaints of the recent proceedings in Convocation at once found

CHAR.
XIV.

take ex-
ception to
the sixth
Canon.

The "Long
Parlia-
ment."

CHAP.
XIV.

Its attack
on the
High
Church
clergy.

loud utterance. It was voted that the libellers Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick should be compensated in large sums by the primate and the other members of the High Commission Court. Then followed a vote that Dr. Cosin, Prebendary of Durham, a leading but inoffensive member of the High Church party, was "superstitious and scandalous." An absurd attempt was even made to impeach him for treason before the Lords. Laud had been directly attacked on November 10, on the strength of a petition from a Kentish clergyman, who declared he had been grievously persecuted by the primate. To secure a substantial basis for his impeachment, the fallen Williams, who had been deservedly imprisoned for subornation of perjury, was released and urged to take proceedings against Laud. Williams had sufficient sense of shame to refuse. The primate was at last formally impugned in both Houses on December 16. The Commons resolved that the recent Canons of Convocation tended to disparage the king's prerogative and the liberty of the subject, and charged Laud with their authorship. The Lords on the same day heard a charge from the Scotch commission, against Strafford and Laud, to the effect that they had forced on the Scotch Church a Liturgy and Canons containing "many dangerous errors in point of doctrine." It was agreed between the Houses that Mr. Holles should impeach the archbishop before the Lords, on the charge of high treason. The primate's warm rejoinder was a pretext for committing him to the custody of Black Rod, and on March 1 he was conveyed to the Tower. Among the bishops, Wren of Ely, and Pierce of Bath and Wells, were selected for attack. Both were impeached and required to find heavy bail for their appearance in the House of Lords.

A little later, they were committed to the Tower, where Wren remained for eighteen years. Strafford was impeached in the following spring, as having subverted true religion and the rights of Parliament. It was found impossible to convict him legally of treason. The Commons, not to be balked of their prey, determined to convict him by a bill of attainder. Charles's timidity impelled him to the crime of ratifying this unrighteous procedure, and the great statesman was May 19, 1641. beheaded.

CHAP.
XIV.

The Church was now to make a terrible atonement for its attachment to absolutist principles. Already the Puritan Commons had begun to tout for petitions against Church discipline or against individual clergymen. The incumbents named in these petitions were summoned forthwith to defend themselves before the House. This was the prelude to an attack which, both in the extent of its range and the pitiless animosity of its procedure, bears comparison with the famous persecutions of the early ages. These severities will be described in detail hereafter. We shall confine ourselves for the present to those proceedings in Parliament which gave them a show of legality. As early as January 31 the House of Commons had assumed to itself a right, unsanctioned by precedent, to appoint a commission for the visitation of churches. The proceeding was a kind of parody on the visitations sanctioned by the Crown in 1547 and 1559. The Commissioners thus appointed were to "demolish and remove . . . all images, altars, or tables turned altar-wise, crucifixes, superstitious pictures, monuments, and reliques of idolatry" out of all churches and chapels. Such was the authority for that work of Vandalism which was in progress during the next twenty years,

The
visita-
tion of
churches.

CHAP.

XIV.

The "Com-
mittee of
Religion.

and which has left its indelible memorial in most of our noblest fanes. The House of Lords was so far drawn along by the stream of popular opinion as to appoint a "Committee of Religion" on March 15. This committee consisted of ten earls, ten barons, and ten bishops. It was to inquire into all religious innovations introduced since the Reformation, and, if requisite, to "examine the degrees and perfection of the Reformation itself." Four bishops only—Williams, Hall, Morton, and Usher—consented to attend the sessions of this committee. Its proceedings were interrupted by the sweeping measures of the Parliament. A strong party in the Lower House longed to decatholize the Church by a prompt extermination of episcopacy and a substitution of the Presbyterian system. This procedure was, of course, warmly advocated by the Scotch commissioners. It was opposed, however, as unnecessary, by many who, though they had headed the cry against absolutist principles, had no fault to find with episcopacy judged on its own merits. And to the Independent contingent, afterwards known as the "Rump," such a scheme savoured too little of anarchy.

Assault on
episcopacy.

In March a measure passed the Lower House, not only disabling clergymen from serving as magistrates, but excluding bishops from the House of Lords. This precipitate alteration of the constitution was rejected in the Upper House. The Commons thereupon made an assault on episcopacy, and got as far on June 15 as the abolition of "deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, and canons." The Presbyterian party were disgusted at the survival of the bishops. The Canons of 1640, that special bugbear of the "Long Parliament," were now utilized as a pretext. An

impeachment was preferred against thirteen bishops for their share in passing these Canons. The absurdity of this expedient was, however, exposed in the plea drawn up for the bishops by Mr. Chute, their counsel. Popular petitions against episcopal government were then prepared. The Church party, however, responded with signatures of far greater weight, and even of larger number, in behalf of the impugned system. Open violence was next tried. The mob was encouraged to insult and assail the bishops on their way to the House, until they found attendance so perilous that they were forced to absent themselves. Twelve of them signed a protest against all laws, orders, votes, etc., passed during their enforced absence. This procedure caused an extraordinary exasperation in the Upper House. The bishops were at once committed to the Tower. Ten of them were released after eighteen days' imprisonment, but on February 6 a bill excluding all the lords spiritual from the Upper House was easily carried.

CHAP.
XIV.

The
spiritual
lords are
mobbed.

And
imprisoned.
Jan. 30,
1642.

To one quarter at least the episcopate might have looked for sympathy and support. The conduct of Charles, however, towards the victims of his absolutist policy only too painfully illustrated the text, "Put not your trust in princes." The weakest point in the absolutist cause was the present king's utter incapacity even to lead his own party. Charles had sacrificed Strafford. In Scotland he had made most disgraceful concessions to the Covenanters, and even ratified a bill which declared that the "government of the Church by archbishops and bishops was repugnant to the Word of God," and that "the prelates were enemies to the propagation of the true reformed Protestant religion."¹

Inconsistency of
King
Charles.

¹ Collier, *Eccles. History*, vol. viii. p. 225.

CHAP.
XIV.

He now assented to the Bill which deprived the English bishops of their seats in the House of Lords. It is supposed that the king's inconsistency was intended for a feat of diplomacy, his object being to break up the alliance of English Presbyterians and Scotch Covenanters. Its real effect was the discouragement or alienation of the thousands who had petitioned for the maintenance of the present constitution in Church and State.

The civil
war.

The Parliamentary faction took up arms this summer, and war raged till the surrender of Oxford in June, 1646. Both parties throughout this period legislated on religious matters, but as the king simply cancelled the innovations introduced by Parliament, it will be sufficient to continue our account of the latter. Until the sword was appealed to, the House had been inclined to tolerate an adaptation of episcopacy to Erastian opinions. The definite severance of Churchmen and Puritans, and the urgent necessity of securing the sympathies of Scotland, now made this compromise impossible. The "Root and Branch Bill," abolishing episcopacy as "a great impediment to Reformation" and "prejudicial to the State," was accordingly carried in September, 1642.

The "Root
and Branch
Bill."

The Cove-
nant ac-
cepted
by the
Commons.
Sept. 1643.

The reluctance with which this concession to the northern religionists was made was indicated by a provision that the Act should not come into operation for a year. But the success of the king's troops soon surmounted all such scruples. The Scotch alliance had to be retained at all costs, and when the commissioners came from the north they required that the English Parliament should accept the "Solemn League and Covenant." An Assembly of Divines had been appointed by the Parliament in June, 1643. It consisted of one

hundred and thirty-one ministers and thirty lay assessors—ten lords and twenty commoners. Some of the ministers were Puritans in Holy Orders, and to give the Assembly an appearance of respectability, Usher and other eminent Churchmen had been named as members. These persons soon ceased to attend the sessions. The Assembly had already begun to revise the Thirty-nine Articles. It now submitted to the humiliating demands of the Scotch Commissioners, and the ordained Puritans pledged themselves, reluctantly or otherwise, to extirpate the source of their ministerial powers. The Covenant was subscribed by the Commons, the Puritan Churchmen therein not excepted, on September 25. It was to be read in every London church on the Sunday following. A few months later, it was ordered that every person above the age of eighteen should renounce the Anglican system by swearing his acceptance of the Covenant. Such were the tender mercies of the pretended advocates of religious liberty when possessed of civil power. Much has been said of the severities of Bancroft and Laud in enforcing conformity on the clerical body; but what were these to the outrage perpetrated on tender consciences when all men were summoned to renounce and denounce the religious system under which they had been nurtured. Of course, one result of these proceedings was the flight of thousands of conscientious clergymen from their benefices. These the Presbyterian divines appropriated to themselves.

And by the
West-
minster
Assembly.
And
enforced on
all adults.
Feb. 18.

In October, 1644, the Assembly of Divines issued a Directory of Public Worship, which was first sent to Scotland for approval, and then sanctioned by the Parliament. In this document certain broad rules

The
Directory
of Public
Worship.
Jan. 1645.

CHAP.
XIV.

were laid down for the conduct of a religious service without liturgy or settled formulæ of any kind, the Lord's Prayer excepted. Heads were given for a State prayer which was to include a petition for the "conversion" of the queen. There were also prescriptions for the administration of the Lord's Supper, which was to be received in a sitting posture. The dead were to be buried without prayers or religious ceremonies. The Presbyterian Directory proved, as might have been expected, generally unpopular. But men were not free to revert to the Church's system. Penalties were provided to restrain the use of the Common Prayer in public or in private—viz. for the first offence a fine of five pounds, for the second ten, for the third a year's imprisonment. The Presbyterian scheme provided also for the formation of *classes*, each representing a certain district. The aspirant to the ministry was first to be elected by a congregation, then to present himself to the presbytery of his *classis*, who were empowered to examine and ordain him. The authority of the presbyters was, however, subsequently modified by an Act of Parliament appointing "Triers," mostly laymen, who were empowered to take part in the examinations and elections. Provincial and national assemblies were also included in the scheme. For guidance in doctrine, the Assembly put forth a Longer and a Shorter Catechism (the latter intended for children), both of a Calvinistic character, and a Confession of Faith which was intended to supersede the Thirty-nine Articles. The thirty-three Articles of this Confession are still subscribed by ministers of the Scotch Presbyterian establishment.

Use of the
Prayer-
book pro-
scribed.
Aug. 1645.

The Pres-
byterian
scheme.

Dec. 1646.

Dissolution
of the
West-
minster
Assembly.

The Presbyterian system, however, was not destined to strike root in England. To the Erastians and Independents it had always appeared only as "prelacy" in

a new guise. Its progress was stayed by the growing strength of the revolutionary party, who, by the "Self-denying Ordinance" of April, 1645, had secured the management of the army. With commendable prescience the divines of the Westminster Assembly began, early in 1647, to disperse to their new benefices, and the sessions of this celebrated body thus came to an end, without collision with the Independent or anarchical sectaries, and indeed without any formal dissolution.

From March to November, 1644, Archbishop Laud had been subjected to a trial on the charge of "high treason." The indictments were drawn up by Prynne, the martyr libeller. Against the primate, says his biographer, were arrayed "the whole of the Puritans, whether Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Familists, or Gospellers: the Jesuits, too, had intrigued against him who was the greatest enemy whom Rome encountered since the days of Luther." The trial was a mere farce. The primate never had the same lords present at his afternoon defence as had heard the morning impeachment. He was denied the assistance of counsel. His witnesses could not be sworn. His private papers and diary had been seized by Prynne; they were mutilated and interpolated by his accusers. Spirited and vigorous notwithstanding his three years' imprisonment, the brave old man defended himself with an eloquence and ability which won the admiration of Prynne himself. He maintained an even temper throughout, though mobbed and insulted by the Puritan fanatics, who were especially irritated by his complete refutation of the charge that he had encouraged "popery." The judges unanimously declared that no act of Laud's was treasonable by any

Archbishop
Laud
unfairly
tried.

CHAP.
XIV.

And done
to death.

known law of the land. The same disgraceful expedient, therefore, was adopted as in the case of Strafford. A bill of attainder was brought into the House of Commons, and was passed on November 13. The Lords, unable to arrest the progress of democratic tyranny, were wont, at this time, to absent themselves from the House when any proceedings of extraordinarily unjust character were to be sanctioned. Six peers only could be induced to vote for the bill in the Upper House. The great champion and confessor of Anglicanism was executed on Tower Hill on January 10, 1645.

June 14,
1645.

Charles
refuses to
sacrifice
the Church,

The career of the unfortunate sovereign was soon to be cut short in a similar manner. The fatal blow at Naseby was succeeded by the siege of Oxford, the flight to the Scotch camp at Newark, and the sale of the fugitive to the English Parliament. As a ruler and a politician, Charles had adopted tortuous causes, the guilt of which is somewhat emphasized by their unsuccessful issue; but when his own safety only was imperilled, he disdained the use of chicanery and craft. He was a sincere believer in the doctrines of the Church, and he would not save his life by repudiating her. The Scotch vainly urged him to secure liberty by sanctioning the Covenant. The English Presbyterians vainly tempted him to make a cession of the Church estates. The utmost that could be wrung from him was an establishment of Presbyterianism side by side with episcopacy, on principles of mutual toleration. The jealousy of the Independent faction was roused by this concession to the rival faction. The king was carried off to Hurst Castle, and Colonel Pride effectually silenced the less anarchical contingent by purging the House of all members save some fifty Independents. These appointed the court of one hundred and thirty-five

commissioners who adjudged the king to be "a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and enemy to the good people of this nation," and sentenced him to "be put to death by severing his head from his body."

The sufferings of English Churchmen during this period of confusion can scarcely be adequately depicted in such a work as the present. The scene presented is in one respect almost without counterpart in the world's history. The cruelties of the dominant party have, of course, been surpassed in many revolutionary epochs. But never, perhaps, have cruelty and hatred, malice and uncharitableness flaunted so audaciously in the garb of religion, or the depths of Pharisaic hypocrisy been so nearly sounded, as in this era of Puritan ascendancy. As early as January, 1641, the Anglican clergy had been assailed with the bitterest invectives in Parliament, and discontented parishioners had been incited to present petitions against their incumbents. Mr. John White had declared, in the House of Commons, that eight thousand of the clergy were "unworthy and scandalous, and deserv'd to be cast out;" and numerous speakers had proved the clergy guilty of "popery, idolatry, superstition, enmity to godliness, malignancy," etc. The gravamen in reality implied nothing more than absolutist tenets and attachment to Church principles. These charges were, however, made a pretext for supplementing the clergy by a force of lecturers, who would tune the pulpits, and thus prepare men's minds for the attack on Church property. No minister could refuse to admit these men into the pulpit without danger of incurring imprisonment or sequestration.¹ Meantime Committees for Scandalous Ministers had been appointed, whose business it was

CHAP.
XIV.

And is
executed.
Jan. 30,
1649.
The per-
secution of
the Church.

The Com-
mittees for
Scandalous
Ministers.

¹ Walker, *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 30.

CHAP.
XIV.

to try every clergyman against whom any sort of charge could be trumped up. These trials resulted almost invariably in the imprisonment and sequestration of the accused. Mr. White, who was the chairman of one committee, and reaped a golden harvest of fees off the sequestered livings, gives an account of these proceedings in his "First Century of Scandalous Malignant Priests," published in 1643. It is instructive to observe how the writer gravely intermingles the grossest aspersions on character and morals with such charges as "bowing at the name of Jesus" and "neglecting the Parliament fasts." In reality the clergy were punished for their religious and political views alone. Viciousness of life was, of course, detected by the Puritan inquisitors wherever High Church and royalist principles prevailed. The clergy generally had espoused these principles. They are accordingly represented as "vermin, . . . popish dregs, given over to vile affections, to superstition, ambition, persecutions, covetousness, malignity, and all wickedness," and, as "priests of Baal, sons of Belial, . . . priests of Bacchus, unclean beasts." Similar language was used by the "godly" lecturers who had invaded the pulpits.

The
Committee
for Plun-
dered
Ministers.

The war soon paved the way for more extended schemes of confiscation. On the pretext that the Puritanical clergy had suffered from the royalist troops, a central Committee for Plundered Ministers was appointed. A great clearance was now made of such clergy as were suspected of "malignant" (*i.e.* "royalist") proclivities, their benefices being given sometimes to Presbyterian ministers, sometimes to self-ordained mechanics. Neither bribery nor oppression could always raise anything like a plausible charge against the victims, and the piety of the com-

missioners often laboured to find a stumbling block. "In Cumberland one clergyman was deprived for hunting; and the charge against another was that he had been seen walking in his garden on a Sunday evening. In Shropshire one was sequestered avowedly for his learning, one of the committee remarking that priests and Jesuits were learned and therefore did the more harm. In Gloucestershire a clergyman's greyhound gave chase to a hare that accidentally crossed his path; this was termed 'coursing on a Sabbath day,' and cost his master his benefice."¹

CHAP.
XIV.

After the acceptance of the Scotch Covenant by Parliament, these pretexts became unnecessary. A pledge of hostility to that form of government which had prevailed in the Church since the Apostolic age was now forced upon the conscience. A clean sweep was made of the clergy who refused to impugn this Catholic essential. Puritans of elastic principles alone survived to share the Church emoluments with the Presbyterians and other sectaries.

The
Covenant
forced
upon the
clergy.
Feb. 1644.

The sufferings consequent on these ejections have not often been surpassed in the annals of religious persecution. It has been estimated that at least seven thousand incumbents (many of them married) were at once deprived of their livelihood. To these must be added a large number of unbeneficed clergymen, curates, schoolmasters, chaplains, etc. A large proportion were relegated to imprisonment, the horrors of which were often intensified by ingenious cruelty. So full were the prisons that the ships on the Thames, and even the pest-houses, were converted into places of confinement. Three Cambridge heads of houses were among the gang of "fourscore prisoners of

Terrible
sufferings
of the
clergy.

¹ Sufferings of the Clergy, p. 126.

CHAP.
XIV.

quality," who were confined under hatches on the Thames, without straw to lie on, and almost without air to breathe, their custodians having deliberately stopped up "all the small auger holes and all other inlets which might relieve them with fresh air."¹ Not many cases of violent death are recorded, but it can hardly be doubted that an immense number of lives were cut short by the rigours of such confinements, and in the cases of the unimprisoned by sheer starvation. It will be borne in mind that the families of the ejected clergymen were left without the means of maintenance. The committees of sequestration in 1643 were indeed enabled to grant one-fifth of the benefice to the families of ejected incumbents, but they did not avail themselves of these powers. In 1647 it was ordered that this allowance should be given. The injunction came, however, after most of the mischief had been done. It was, moreover, clogged by so many provisoes on the part of the commissioners, and was so easily evaded by the usurping preacher, that it rarely brought the victims any relief.

Fate of the
bishops.

Of the bishops Skinner of Oxford appears to have come off best. He was allowed to retire to the rectory of Launton, in Oxfordshire, and seems to have used the Prayer-book services there with impunity until the Restoration. Williams espoused the cause of the Parliament, and died in disrepute in 1650. "Of the whole number," says Mr. Walker, "one was beheaded without any colour of law, and one joined the faction which had ruined his brethren; eighteen died in poverty; only nine survived the confusions and were restored to their sees, and of these one had been imprisoned for eighteen years."

¹ See the account in *Mercurius Rusticus*, chap. xii.

To the wanton acts of desecration perpetrated by the fanatics hundreds of our churches still bear witness. The iconoclastic frenzy apparently reached its height in the years 1643–45. In 1644 the notorious William Dowsing records his destruction of crosses, pictures, carved work, stained glass, and “superstitious inscriptions in brass” in about a hundred and fifty Suffolk churches. A similar work of devastation was going on in all parts of the country. The universities suffered more especially as centres both of loyalty and Church principle. Cambridge was made the garrison town of the seven associated counties. King’s College Chapel became a parade-ground for the rebel forces; the college bridges were defaced; the groves were cut down and sold for timber; the orchards and gardens were laid waste. Libraries, museums, even the rooms of students, were ransacked and despoiled. The chapels were desecrated and defaced by Dowsing and his associates, and each college was charged a fee of forty shillings for the job. In imitation of the visitation of the monasteries in 1535, an oath of discovery was put to the fellows and students, binding them to accuse each other of malignancy, etc.¹ At the so-called “regulation” of 1543, twelve masters and over three hundred and fifty fellows, scholars, and exhibitioners were ejected, and many of them imprisoned. The Earl of Manchester filled up some of these places with his own creatures. But the greater part of the revenues were appropriated to provide the expenses of the war. In 1649, when the Independents had gained the ascendancy, another “regulation” was authorized, and the “Engagement” was enforced instead of the Covenant. Oxford had undergone considerable harassing in 1642–43. Its surrender

CHAP.
XIV.

Of the
churches.

Of the
universi-
ties.

¹ Querela Cantabrigiensis, p. 20.

CHAP.
XIV.

in 1646 was succeeded by a formal visitation. So dauntless was the attitude of the whole university body, that the work of the visitors was not completed till 1649. It appears that almost all the masters and fellows and scholars were deprived, ejected, or imprisoned for disallowing the authority of the visitors and refusing the Covenant. Some five hundred persons were thus reduced to destitution. In their place came the illiterate rabble described by Anthony Wood. "The generality of them had mortified countenances, puling voices, and eyes commonly, when in discourse, lifted up, with hands laying on their breasts. They mostly had short hair (which at this time was commonly called the committee-cut), and went in *cuervo*, in a shabbed condition, and looked rather like 'prentices or antiquated school-boys than academicians or ministers."

Such is the story of nine years of Puritan persecution. Its fury abated about the year 1649, when seemingly no more outrages could well be devised. The clergy had by this time been reduced to a miserable state of destitution, and all ecclesiastical property had been confiscated or profaned. Moreover, the spoilers had begun to wrangle over the booty, and the mutual jealousies of Presbyterian and Independent diverted their attention from their common foe. This respite, however, was destined to be of short duration. The full fierceness of the tempest was yet to be felt ere the horizon cleared.

CHAPTER XV.

The Interregnum.

A.D. 1649-1660.

Independents in the ascendant—Character of this sect—The “Engagement” substituted for the Covenant—Rise of strange and immoral sects—The Anglicans excluded from toleration—Yet the clergy continue to officiate—Appointment of the “Triers”—Cromwell’s unsuccessful overtures—The clergy driven from their employments—The Anglican system kept alive by courageous Churchmen—The period of anarchy—The Restoration.

THE five years succeeding the execution of King Charles form a period of wild religious anarchy, of which it will be unnecessary to give a detailed account. The predominant sect was that of the Brownists or Independents, deriving its origin from the Elizabethan fanatic Robert Brown. The anti-Church principles at one time held by Brown had been worked up into a system, which professedly made each congregation a law to itself. Hence the assumption of the titles “Independents” and “Congregationalists.” This form of sectarianism had been fostered by the outcry against “prelacy” and “Arminianism” in the reigns of James and Charles. It was distinguished by a rancorous hatred of all other systems; and was scarcely less savagely hostile to the Presbyterians and Quakers than to the Anglicans and Romanists. The Independents, who had been forced to leave England in the reign of James, carried this intolerance with them to Virginia,

Independents in the ascendant.

Character of this sect.

CHAP.
XV.

The "Engagement" substituted for the Covenant.

Rise of strange and immoral sects.

and, by their cruelties to the other religionists, kept up the illiberal spirit of the Middle Ages long after the principles of religious tolerance had found general acceptance in England.¹ The present time, however, was hardly suitable for religious persecution, and the *régime* of the Independents was, until 1655, less oppressive than that of the Presbyterians. One great boon to the Church was the substitution of a political test in the place of the odious Presbyterian Covenant. Within a week after Charles's execution, the "Rump" had decreed that the House of Lords was "useless and dangerous," and the office of king "unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous." The clergy were summoned to sign the "Engagement," which pledged them to accept this mutilation of the constitution, and to recognize the authority of the "Rump." This was, at all events, better than enforced repudiation of the Church's system, and many clergy who thought the cause of the Stuart family hopeless signed the "Engagement."

As a natural consequence of the suspension of established religion, a hydra-headed sectarianism infested the land, and the most absurd and immoral systems claimed the sanction of Christianity and succeeded in gaining

¹ The disorderly and scurrilous "Independents" who emigrated in the *Mayflower* in 1620 have been sometimes regarded as the victims of ecclesiastical tyranny and the friends of religious freedom. The true claimants for such sympathy are rather the Roman Catholics, Baptists, Quakers, and Unitarians, who formed the minority in the settlement. The ecclesiastical tyranny these religionists writhed under was that of the "Pilgrim Fathers," or Independent majority. They were subjected to every form of cruelty. The law of 1656 concerning Quakers ordered that every Quaker who landed should be whipped, imprisoned with hard labour, and finally expelled from the colony. The Romanists were also expelled. The Unitarians were executed. The Baptists were harassed by various rigorous statutes. The "sabbath-breaker" was to suffer capital punishment. When we read of three Quaker women being flogged through eleven villages in frost and snow, of ship captains being flogged for happening to bring Quakers into port, and of numerous colonists being hanged on allegations of sorcery and blasphemy, we may well hesitate before we associate the cause of the "Pilgrim Fathers" with that of freedom of conscience. (See Curteis' "Dissent in its relation to the Church," pp. 82, 83.)

followers. The least pernicious of the new formations, probably, though the one most disliked by Cromwell, was the Quaker sect, the disciples of George Fox, an enthusiast who taught a doctrine of internal illumination akin to that of the mediæval mysticists. The best known of the other sects are the Vanists, Fifth Monarchists, Seekers, Ranters, Familists, and Behmenists. The tendency of the teaching of the sectaries is sufficiently illustrated by an Act passed in August, 1650. This inflicted sentence on all who should profess "that the acts of adultery, drunkenness, swearing, etc., are in their own nature as holy and righteous as the duties of prayer, preaching, or giving thanks to God; that there is really no such thing as unrighteousness or sin independent of conscience and opinion; that there is neither heaven nor hell, etc."¹

The new constitution, forcibly introduced by Cromwell in December, 1653, classed Anglicans and Romanists and teachers of licentiousness as undeserving of the toleration extended to every form of religious opinion. Things, however, were in too confused a state to admit of an organized persecution of faithful Churchmen. Many clergy who had signed the "Engagement" had contrived to regain a footing, and now celebrated the rites of the Church without molestation. To secure themselves against the statute of August, 1645, they sometimes repeated the Offices without book, or adopted variations closely resembling the proscribed formulæ. At S. Gregory's, near S. Paul's, the Anglican form of worship appears to have been conducted in the usual way till Christmas Day, 1655, when Dr. Wild delivered what Evelyn calls "the funeral sermon of preaching." Evelyn mentions a few other churches where ordained

The
Anglicans
excluded
from
toleration.

Yet the
clergy con-
tinue to
officiate.

¹ Collier, Ecclesiastical History, vol. ix. p. 378.

CHAP.

XV.

Appoint-
ment
of the
"Triers."

clergymen were to be found in the years 1652-53. The first blow struck at this remnant of the priesthood was the establishment of an inquisitorial commission, called "Triers," in March, 1654. The new *régime* had become hateful, and it was thought wise to "tune the pulpits." An ordinance was accordingly issued, complaining that the ministry contained still many "weak, scandalous, popish, and ill-affected persons." Thirty-five commissioners were named, who were to test both the political views and the spiritual experiences of all occupants of pulpits. Five Triers were empowered to approve, and nine to reject. One of the most active Triers was a very immoral actor, named Hugh Peters, who professed to have experienced a call, and now conducted himself with intolerable insolence. The state of the soul, the date of "conversion," the "assurance" of the converted person—these and similar secrets of the inner life were to be laid bare before the Puritan confessional. It may be imagined what kind of persons earned its testamur.

Cromwell's
unsuccess-
ful over-
tures.

Severer measures were yet to be inflicted. It appears that about this time the hostile attitude of the Presbyterians induced Cromwell to make some advances to Usher, Brownrigg, and other leading clergy. But the persistent loyalty of the Anglicans to the Stuart cause soon convinced him that a conciliatory policy would be fruitless. The Protector vented his feelings of disappointment and anger in the cruel edict of November 24, 1655. This prohibited the employment of all ministers, fellows, or schoolmasters who had experienced ejection or sequestration. No such persons were to engage in tuition, serve as chaplains, preach, or administer the sacraments. This vindictive measure was designed to ruin those ejected clergy who had hitherto supported

themselves as chaplains and private tutors in the royalist households. It also drove from their cures many who had been restored by the action of their parishioners. The same edict re-enforced the proscription of the Liturgy, and altered the penalty from a fine to imprisonment. In every district commissioners were appointed to enforce these provisions.

CHAP.

XV.

This must have been the darkest hour in the whole period of persecution. Much, however, was done secretly by munificent Churchmen to diminish the sufferings of the destitute clergy. Even now such men as Hammond and Sheldon were securing the continuance of a learned ministry by providing for the education of young men of promise. These obtained ordination from Bishop Skinner at Launton, or Bishop Dupa at Richmond, or from refugee diocesans on the Continent. The services of our Church were now usually conducted in private chambers. Some of the priesthood, however, still openly performed the duties to which they had been ordained, in defiance of unrighteous edicts. As late as Christmas Day, 1657, Evelyn was present at a celebration of Holy Communion in Exeter Chapel, London, which was interrupted by an invasion of soldiery.

The Anglican system kept alive by courageous Churchmen.

The odious rule of Puritanism practically collapsed on the death of Cromwell. The removal of that "iron hand which had prevented the various sects of fanatics from tearing each other in pieces," was succeeded by an outburst of anarchy, which compelled the Presbyterians to range themselves on the side of the loyalists. After Monk's resuscitation of the "Long Parliament," there was a brief period of suspense. The re-establishment of Presbyterianism was, of course, desired by this assembly. Its tenets were declared to be the national

Sept. 3,

1658.

The period of anarchy.

CHAP.
XV.

The Resto-
ration.

May 1,
1660.

faith, and it was ordered that copies of the Covenant should be hung up in all churches. The nation, however, was thoroughly sick of the hypocrisy and insolence of the sectarian systems, and longed for the re-establishment of Church and king. Monk, the professed leader of Presbyterians, had sufficient sagacity to read the signs of the times. He turned traitor to his party, and undertook to establish Charles unconditionally. The king issued the "Declaration of Breda," promising pardon to those concerned in the rebellion, and toleration "of differences of opinion in matters of religion." A universal ebullition of joy marked the restoration of the constitution, and the re-establishment of the Church in that position from which she had been illegally deposed.

CHAPTER XVI.

Charles II.

A.D. 1660-1685.

The Puritan deputation to the Hague—The petition for alterations in the Church system—Reform of the episcopal system: how far desirable—The Presbyterian proposal on the subject—The “Worcester House Declaration”—Rejected by the “Convention Parliament”—Appointment of the Savoy Conference—The policy of the bishops—Baxter’s “Reformed Liturgy”—The “Petition to the Bishops”—The eight grievances of the Puritans—The conference fruitless—Jealous conservatism of the Parliament—Convocation charged to review the Prayer-book—Valuable services of Cosin—The revised Prayer-book sanctioned by an “Act of Uniformity”—The Catholic party victorious—The usurping incumbents—“Black Bartholomew’s”—The Anglican revival—The clergy resign their right of taxing themselves in Convocation—The political relations of the Church from 1660 to 1672—And from 1672 to 1685—Charles coquets with the Dissenters—And rouses the indignation of the Commons—The Acts for repressing nonconformity—The “Declaration of Indulgence”—The Commons co-operate with the Dissenters against the Romanists—The “Test Act”—Persecution of Romanists—James supported by the bishops—Discoveries of plots—Prevalence of immorality—The age of great divines—Rise of the Latitudinarians.

THE Presbyterian divines were slow to appreciate the marked reaction against Puritanism and all its belongings. Some ten of their party, including Reynolds, Calamy, Case, and Manton, had waited on Charles II. at the Hague, and demanded toleration for their system. Charles, with consummate tact, quoted their own principle that the Houses of Parliament were “the best judges what indulgence and toleration was necessary for the repose of the kingdom.” When these divines proceeded to press him to prohibit his chaplains from wearing the surplice, he replied that

The
Puritan
deputation
to the
Hague.

CHAP.
XVI.

The
petition for
alterations
in the
Church
system.

personally he claimed the same liberty in matters of religion as themselves. The unpopularity of this party was, however, as yet indiscernible to the king, and he appears to have thought that large concessions would be necessary. To secure its goodwill he made nine of the leading Presbyterian divines royal chaplains. Thus encouraged, the Puritans proceeded to draw up a petition for sweeping changes in the Prayer-book and the ecclesiastical constitution. They demanded that the prayers should be recast in Scripture phraseology; that oaths of conformity should not be required of the clergy; that such ceremonies as wearing the surplice, signing with the cross at Baptism, and bowing at the name of our Saviour, should be discontinued; and that communicants should not be required to kneel.

Reform
of the
episcopal
system:
how far
desirable.

Coupled with these stereotyped Puritan requisitions was a less exceptionable demand for a reform of the episcopate. We have pointed out that the Reformation settlement had so far tended to an undue aggrandizement of the first order of clergy, in respect of ecclesiastical powers and social status. The episcopate had been left independent of the priesthood, and was empowered to rule without deference to synods. Its members were too few in number, even for the present population. The bishops might easily become an aristocratic caste, devoted to theories of secular policy, rather than to the work of superintending Christ's Church; "lords over God's heritage," rather than "examples to the flock." A similar exaltation of the episcopate, at the expense of the other clerical orders, has been noticed among the abuses of the præ-Reformation period, and indeed lay at the very root of the mediæval theory of papal supremacy. The survival of

a secularized and autocratic episcopate had given offence in the recent reigns to many¹ who had no objection to bishops in their legitimate capacity. It was destined to become a stereotyped abuse, and to sap the Church's vitality for many years to come.

The Presbyterians proposed a scheme of reform which might well have received more favourable consideration at the subsequent settlement. They were prepared to acknowledge episcopacy, but the power of the bishops was to be limited by provisions akin to those recently suggested by Archbishop Usher.² They desired "the true primitive presidency in the Church, with a due mixture of presbyters." They objected to "the great extent of the bishop's diocese; their deputing commissaries, chancellors, and officials to act in their stead; their assuming the sole power of ordination³ and jurisdiction, and acting so arbitrarily in

The Presbyterian proposal on the subject.

¹ The feeling on this subject is illustrated by Lord Falkland's speech in Parliament in 1641. Falkland defended the episcopal system, but argued that the modern bishops had only opposed the Papacy beyond the seas that they might establish one at home. "If," he continues, "their temporal title, power, and employment appear likely to distract them from the care of, or make them look down upon, their spiritual duty, and the too great distance between them and those they govern will hinder the free and fit recourse of their inferiors to them, and occasion insolence from them to their inferiors, let that be considered and cared for. I am sure neither their lordships, their judging of tithes, wills, and marriages, etc., nor their voices in Parliament, are *jure divino*, and I am sure that these titles and this power are not necessary to their authority," etc.

² Usher's scheme of reform is propounded in the interesting tract entitled "Episcopal and Presbyterian Government conjoined," first printed in 1679. This was after the archbishop's death, and it has been questioned whether he intended the tract for publication in its present form. Usher argues that in the early times, "with the bishop, who was the chief president, . . . the rest of the dispensers of the Word and Sacraments joined in the common government of the Church." He proposes the re-establishment of the "synodical conventions of the pastors of every parish," under the presidency of suffragan bishops. Besides these diocesan synods, he provides for provincial synods, to which the clergy are to send representatives. Disputed questions at these synods are to be settled by a majority vote.

³ This allegation may have rested on some misunderstanding of the Anglican use. The Prayer-books of 1549, 1552, 1559, and 1604 all contain the present rubric, which directs that such priests as are present shall join with the bishop in laying hands on the candidate for the priesthood.

CHAP.
XVI.

visitation articles." The remedies suggested were the appointment of suffragans, to be chosen by their respective synods, and the limitation of episcopal autocracy by synodical action.

Whether any insidious design against episcopacy itself was veiled under these moderate demands, cannot now be ascertained. As they stand, they appear consistent with the theory of ecclesiastical organization accepted in the early ages. Had they been more favourably received, the Church would have, perhaps, escaped the paralyzing influences of the Georgian period, with its secularized bishops, Erastian opinions, and repudiation of the rights of Convocation. But the recent cruelties of triumphant Presbyterianism still rankled in men's minds, and the hour of restoration was not the time for impugning autocracy, whether royal or episcopal. Charles, indeed, still overrating the strength of the Puritan faction, ordered Clarendon to draw up the markedly concessory document, known as the "Worcester House Declaration." This not only promised a large increase of the episcopate, and an admission of priests to certain departments of diocesan jurisdiction, but held out hopes of a review of the Liturgy. For the present it allowed disuse of such prayers and ceremonies of the Prayer-book as individual ministers might object to.¹ It has been supposed, however, that Clarendon of set purpose introduced into the Declaration more concessions than the "Convention Parliament" would be likely to allow. At any rate, it was rejected in the Commons by a majority of twenty-six. The king, nevertheless, considered it politic to appoint a commission, to consider the demerits of the Prayer-book, in accordance with the promise of

The
"Worcester
House
Declara-
tion."
Oct. 25.

Rejected
by the
"Conven-
tion Parlia-
ment."
March 25,
1661.

¹ Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. viii. pp. 412, seqq.

the Declaration. The royal warrant was addressed to twelve bishops and twelve Presbyterian divines, nine supernumeraries being allowed on each side. The conference was to meet at the Bishop of London's lodgings in the Savoy. Its sessions might extend over four months from the day of opening (April 15).

The "Caroline" episcopate already included some of its immortal names. Nine bishops had survived the interregnum. Of these the aged Juxon, who had attended King Charles in his last moments, was appointed to the primacy, which had been vacant since the death of Laud. Among the newly appointed bishops were Cosin, the celebrated liturgiologist; Sanderson, eminent as a theologian and casuist; Gauden, who had published the "Eikon Basiliké" and "The Appeal to Cromwell;" and Walton, the laborious editor of the Polyglot Bible. Three eminent Puritans, Calamy, Baxter, and Reynolds, had also been offered bishoprics, but Reynolds was the only one of the three whose conscience permitted him to conform and accept the preferment. All these persons took part in the present Conference.¹

The Savoy Conference is important as paving the way for that work of liturgical review which gave our Church her present Prayer-book, and which may be justly regarded as the terminus of the English Reformation. Archbishop Juxon was precluded by age and infirmity from taking an active part in the con-

¹ The commissioners for the Church were Archbishop Frewen and Bishops Sheldon, Cosin, Sterne, Bryan Walton, King, Gauden, Sanderson, Laney, Warner, Henchman, Morley. The nine assisting commissioners were Doctors Barwick, Earle, Gunning, Hacket, Heylin, Pearson, Pierce, Sparrow, and Mr. Thorndike. The Puritan commissioners were Bishop Reynolds; Doctors Conant, Marston, Spenslow, Tuckney, and Wallis; and Messrs. Baxter, Calamy, Case, Clark, Jackson, and Newcomen. These were assisted by Doctors Bates, Collins, Cooper, Horton, Jacomb, and Lightfoot, and Messrs. Drake, Rawlinson, and Woodbridge.

CHAP.

XVI.

The policy
of the
bishops.

Baxter's
"Reformed
Liturgy."

ference or the subsequent sessions of Convocation. Frewen, the northern primate, took his place as president; Sheldon, Bishop of London, however, was the working leader of the Anglican commissioners. What the bishops really desired was a more emphatic assertion of those Catholic principles which one school of Reformers had always faithfully maintained, and which had been the mainstay and comfort of all faithful Churchmen throughout the period of persecution. This result was actually obtained at the subsequent revision. The bishops were, however, content with the Prayer-book as it stood, provided it was protected against future assaults of Puritanism. Sheldon was not slow to appreciate the strength of his position. He wisely drew the enemy's fire on the first day of the conference, by demanding that the Puritans should state their objections to the Liturgy. The first response to this request was made a fortnight later, by the celebrated Baxter,¹ who had spent this his time in composing a "Reformed Liturgy," in Scripture phrase, which he coolly laid before the meeting as a proper substitute for our Prayer-book.

The other Puritan divines were meanwhile occupied

¹ This remarkable person had been ordained in 1638, and appointed to the vicarage of Kidderminster. As he declared in 1660 that he accepted all the doctrinal part of the Prayer-book, it must be supposed that he joined the revolutionary party from dislike of the Church's ritual. He appears to have been staggered by the overthrow of the monarchy, and expressed his views on the subject somewhat plainly to Cromwell. He kept on good terms, however, with the Rump, and held a chaplaincy in Colonel Whalley's regiment till 1657. At the Caroline settlement he exhibited a more intolerant and uncompromising temper than most of his Puritan brethren. Persisting in nonconformity, he was compelled to vacate his living at Kidderminster. He was twice imprisoned under the Acts for suppression of dissent, and both times liberated on an informality. During King James's phase of antagonism towards Dissenters, Baxter was arrested on a charge of sedition, brow-beaten by Judge Jeffreys, and put in prison for eighteen months. Baxter is distinguished as an author of treatises on religious "experience," and his "Saint's Everlasting Rest" and "Call to the Unconverted" are still held in estimation.

in drawing up a less pretentious document, containing a catalogue of definite objections to the Prayer-book.¹

This was presented in the form of a "Petition to the bishops." The petition elicited a reply, defending most of the points attacked, but also offering a few concessions of small importance. The reply drew more writing from the voluminous Baxter. Time was thus frittered away; and only ten days were left of the appointed four months, when it was decided that there should be a formal *vivâ voce* discussion of the points at issue. The Anglicans wisely maintained the position that it was incumbent on the Puritan delegates to state their case against the Liturgy. Three disputants were chosen on each side, and the Puritans were invited by Bishop Cosin to declare what they considered *sinful* and what *inexpedient* in the Church system. The student will probably be satisfied with an enumeration of the eight points which the Puritans denounced as "sinful" and "contrary to the Word of God." These were—(1) The surplice; (2) The cross in Baptism; (3) Calling all baptized persons regenerate; (4) Kneeling at the Lord's Supper; (5) Administering the Sacrament to the impenitent and the sick; (6) The Absolution; (7) Returning thanks indiscriminately for all departed Christians in the Burial Service; (8) Subscription to the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles. The Churchmen were unable to regard these things as sinful or unscriptural, and the

CHAP.
XVI.

The
"Petition
to the
Bishops."

The eight
grievances
of the
Puritans.

The
Conference
fruitless.

¹ They urge that as the earlier reformers had made concessions to the "papists," so now the way to conformity ought to be made smooth for Protestants. They object to congregational prayers, saints' days, observance of Lent, the assumption that the Church is a congregation of regenerate persons, the use of the term "priest," and the survival in the Epistles and Gospels of some translations differing from the version of 1611. They desire that the minister may be at liberty to substitute prayers of his own composition for part of the Liturgy, also that the Old Testament Apocrypha may not be read: see Collier, vol. viii. pp. 421-425.

CHAP.

XVI.

Zealous
conserva-
tism of the
Parlia-
ment.

July 9.

Convoca-
tion
charged to
review the
Prayer-
book:

Valuable
services of
Cosin.

term fixed for its dissolution having arrived, the Savoy Conference closed without practical result.

It may indeed be doubted whether the country would have tolerated any important concessions to Puritanism. The new Parliament was in no mood to treat nonconformist susceptibilities with tenderness. It had forbidden petitions for alterations in Church matters that had not the sanction of three justices of the peace, and it allowed none but communicants to be members of the House. To provide against possible half-heartedness on the part of the bishops, it now passed an "Act of Uniformity" enforcing the use of the Liturgy of 1604.

But a more satisfactory settlement of the Puritan controversy was impending. Convocation had hitherto been occupied with a review of the Canons of 1604 and 1640, and the formation of the offices for the 30th of January and 29th of May. But in October Juxon received royal letters directing that the Houses of his province should proceed to make a review of the Prayer-book. Archbishop Frewen received a similar mandate in November. The northern Houses agreed to send delegates to the Canterbury Convocation, and the latter put the business in the hands of a committee of eight bishops,¹ whose work was laid before the Houses as it proceeded. For the important and valuable alterations now made in the Liturgy we are doubtless indebted mainly to Bishop Cosin.² The Puritan Baxter had composed a brand-new Prayer-book in fourteen

¹ These bishops were Cosin of Durham, Wren of Ely, Skinner of Oxford, Warner of Rochester, Henchman of Salisbury, Morley of Worcester, Sanderson of Lincoln, and Nicholson of Gloucester. Robert Pory, John Pearson, and Anthony Sparrowe were admitted as delegates from the Lower House towards the close of the proceedings.

² Mr. Parker calculates that probably "not more than ten out of every hundred" alterations suggested in Cosin's annotated Prayer-book were rejected by the committee.—Introduction to the Revisions, p. ccccxvvi.

days; the less ambitious Cosin had been labouring for forty years in collecting and collating the materials for a revision. His annotated Prayer-Books now supplied the reviewers with ample resources. How exhaustive this review was may be gathered from the fact that the alterations made were no less than six hundred in number. Most of these were of no doctrinal significance. Certainly none of them can be regarded as concessions to the Precisian faction. The importance of those which bear on the Offices for Holy Communion and Baptism¹ will be appreciated when we recollect what was the Puritan doctrine on the subject of sacramental grace.

The new Prayer-book was detained for two months by the king and Council. Some fresh alterations were now made and submitted to the approval of Convocation.² When it had received the final sanction of royalty, it was submitted to the Lords, who voted that the recent "Act of Uniformity" should be construed as applying to this Prayer-book. Thence it went to the Commons, where all the alterations were accepted without debate. The last "Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers and the Administration of the Sacraments" was now passed. By this Act every parson, vicar, and curate was ordered to testify his acceptance of the new Prayer-book before S. Bartholomew's Day

The revised Prayer-book sanctioned by an "Act of Uniformity." March 17, 1662.

May 19.

¹ See pp. 237, 238. Besides the important changes there enumerated we may notice the following features in the revision of 1661-62. The five prayers which follow the third Collect in the Morning and Evening Services had stood hitherto at the end of the Litany. These were moved to their present position. The prayers for the Ember Weeks, for Parliament, for all Conditions of Men, and for Restoring Public Peace at Home were now introduced, as also the General Thanksgiving. A few new collects were introduced, and some collects already existent were slightly altered. The Baptismal Service for those of Riper Years, and the forms for the 5th of November, the 30th of January, and the 29th of May, were inserted at this revision.

² On these alterations see Parker, Introduction to Revisions, pp. cccxxxiv. seqq.

CHAP.

XVI.

(Aug. 24), on pain of ejection. All who had not been properly ordained were to obtain ordination from their diocesans before this date.¹

The
Catholic
party
victorious.

Such was the issue of the struggle that had been raging ever since the accession of Elizabeth. The impolitic conduct of the Puritans had supplied the Anglican party with the weapons which had won them the victory. They had appealed for a final settlement of the Liturgical controversy. The verdict was given when the Caroline Prayer-book, with its concessions to the Anglo-Catholic school, was cheerfully accepted by the Church, the king, and the Parliament.

The
usurping
incumbents
resign.

About a thousand of the persecuted incumbents had survived the interregnum, and been restored to their benefices by an Act passed at the beginning of the reign. There still remained, however, a large number of usurping nonconformists of divers persuasions, and these now had to decide whether they would accept the doctrine of the Church wherein they had constituted themselves teachers, or resign their benefices. At least eighteen hundred adopted the latter alternative. Many of them were illiterate tradesmen and artisans. These returned to the secular pursuits they had quitted. Several were allowed to occupy chaplaincies in almshouses, gaols, and noblemen's families.

"Black
Bartholomew's."

The anniversary of the ejection of these intruders is, however, commemorated as "Black Bartholomew's" in the Puritan Calendar, and their fate is represented as peculiarly pitiable, because Charles had led them to expect concessions by the Declarations from Breda and Worcester House. To credit Charles with sincerity of

¹ The Act also demanded an abjuration of the anti-Episcopalian Covenant, and a renunciation of the "traitorous position" that it is lawful to take up arms against the king.

intention is probably impossible. It must be remembered, however, that Parliament would not have permitted him to show toleration had he wished it. Bearing in mind the cruel persecution which the legitimate incumbents had undergone in the day of Puritan triumph, we shall rather be inclined to wonder that a sweeping ejectionment of the usurpers did not take place in 1660. The country appears to have borne the retirement of the preachers with equanimity, and the new incumbents were generally received with enthusiastic acclamations. The popularity of Puritanism had, in fact, been sapped by the proceedings of the last twenty years. The Church made steady progress in the affections of the people, and under the rule of Juxon's successor, Archbishop Sheldon, a real impulse was given to the cause of Anglo-Catholicism. Here and there slovenly ritual betrayed that the incumbent was a conforming Puritan. Generally, however, decency and order prevailed. The surplice and the clerical dress, if not always worn, were no longer ostentatiously impugned. The altars gradually regained their legitimate position in the chancels, and the Church's great act of worship resumed its proper place in the Anglican cult. Even in the see of Norwich, hitherto the fountain-head of Puritanism, the Church system recovered popularity. In 1676, according to Dr. Sherlock, all the nonconformists, the Romanists included, were but a twentieth part of the population.

The
Anglican
revival.

By the Caroline Settlement the doctrinal position of the Church was established, its liturgical apparatus completed. Henceforth we have only to sketch the history of the Reformed Anglo-Catholic institution in its political and social relations. An important modification in the clerical status may first be noticed as

The clergy
resign their
right of

CHAP.

XVI.

taxing
themselves
in Con-
vocation.

introduced in 1664, when the clergy were persuaded by Sheldon to resign their ancient right of taxing themselves in Convocation. For this change the way was prepared by the usurpation of the sectarian divines, who had placed themselves on a footing with the laity for purposes of taxation. Convocation had, however, voted supplies in the usual way on the accession of Charles, and Sheldon's innovation may, perhaps, be regarded as a device for protecting the Church from the unconscionable exactions of the new sovereign. The alteration was by no means an unqualified blessing. It necessarily lowered the dignity of Convocation, and it afforded a pretext for that unrighteous suppression of the Church's representative body which was effected under George I. The first Parliamentary bill for supply in which clerical possessions were included passed in November, 1664. Two subsidies lately voted in Convocation were remitted as a set off, and the statute on the subject disclaims all intention of prejudicing the ancient rights of the Church.¹ The clergy henceforth had the same rights as other citizens as concerned voting for Parliament and sitting therein as members. The latter of these rights was most unjustly taken away in the year 1802.

The
political
relations of
the Church
from 1660
to 1672.

For the first twelve years of this reign, the amity of the Commons towards the Church continued unimpaired, and Puritan nonconformity was rigorously suppressed by Acts of Parliament. The king's policy was to use both the Anglicans and the Dissenters as his tools. During these years he usually posed as the champion of aggrieved nonconformists, with the twofold object of establishing a claim to issue dispensations, and of obtaining relief for Romanism, the

¹ 16 & 17 Car. II. c. 1.

religion to which he secretly inclined. At the close of this period, Charles's pronounced patronage of Romanism compelled the Commons to shift their position, and league with the Dissenters on a "no popery" basis. The court thereupon again sought the alliance of the prelates. The Church suffered as before for its conscientious attachment to principles of absolutism. From Charles it experienced nothing but duplicity and ingratitude, and for his sake it impaired its recently recovered popularity.

CHAP.
XVI.

And from
1672 to
1685.

As early as December, 1662, the king issued a Declaration which was a manifest bid for Dissenting support. He promised therein to move Parliament to cede indulgence to nonconformity, so that he might "exercise with more universal satisfaction that power of dispensing which we conceive to be in us." The Commons indignantly remonstrated, urging that this offer contravened the "Act of Uniformity," and was calculated to increase sectarianism and foster popery. The king had to give way. The Commons were determined that Puritanism should not rise from its ashes, and that Church and State should not again be endangered for Stuart theories of absolutism. Among the clergy the Declaration had produced a panic, as obviously calculated to revive the religious disorders of the past. Petitions were presented against "the strange prodigious race of men who laboured to throw off the yoke of government, both civil and ecclesiastical." Laws were demanded for the suppression of the Anabaptists, and for the exaction of fines for non-attendance at church. The Commons, nothing loth, responded to these requests by passing some rigorous measures against the sectaries. The first "Con-

Charles
coquets
with the
Dissenters.
Dec. 1662.

And rouses
the indig-
nation
of the
Commons:

The Acts
for repress-
ing non-

CHAP.

XVI.

conformity.
A.D. 1664.

meetings. Not more than five persons, besides the members of the household, could be present at any religious meeting where the Liturgy was not used. A third breach of the law on this subject rendered the offender liable to transportation to the American plantations. The Commons waxed more determined in their policy when it was found that the king was tempting the Lords to sell toleration by way of augmenting the revenue. In 1665 came the "Five Mile Act," prohibiting nonconformist ministers who refused the oaths from coming within five miles of the parish in which they had ministered, till they should be compliant; the penalty for infringement of the Act to be a fine of £40, and six months' imprisonment.

A.D. 1670.

In 1670 a second "Conventicle Act" was passed, more searching and extensive in its scope, but less severe in respect to penalties. The Baptists and the Quakers appear to have been the chief sufferers under these statutes. Actuated by the motives already mentioned, the king persistently espoused the nonconformist cause. Clarendon, "the best of writers, the best of patriots, and the best of men," was disgraced and imprisoned for refusing to sacrifice the Church. The licentious courtiers were encouraged to insult and deride the bishops. At last, in March, 1672, there appeared a royal "Declaration of Indulgence," suspending all penalties against nonconformity, and allowing the continuance of Dissenting conventicles, and the celebration of Romanist worship in private houses. This manifesto received scant respect in the House of Commons. It was voted, by a majority of fifty-two, that the "king's prerogative in matters ecclesiastical does not extend to repealing Acts of Parliament," and Charles was forced to submit.

The "De-
claration
of Indul-
gence."
March,
1672.

The Declaration was rightly interpreted as meaning that the king was under the same religious influences as his brother the Duke of York, and was bent on securing concessions to Romanism. This discovery altered the conditions of the contest. The nonconformist sectary had always been ready to persecute the Roman Catholic, however clamorous his cry for toleration for his own shibboleths. The Commons, therefore, turned from the prelates, and began to conciliate the Dissenters, with the hope of securing their co-operation in resisting the progress of Romanism. A "Test Act" directed against the Romanists obliged all officers, civil and military, to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, to receive the Holy Communion according to the Anglican rites, and to make an express declaration against transubstantiation. In return for the support given by the Dissenters to the "Test Act," the Commons proposed a bill granting them toleration. This failed to pass the Lords. A bill for the "comprehension" of Dissenters was prepared by Sir Matthew Hale in 1674, but was stopped by the king, who was now on the side of the Church.

CHAP.
XVI.

The Commons co-operate with the Dissenters against the Romanists. The "Test Act."
A.D. 1673.

The last eight years of this reign further embittered the animosity against the Roman Catholics. In 1678 a conspiracy, real or imaginary, was revealed by the infamous Titus Oates, having for its object the restoration of popery. Several eminent persons were brought to the scaffold as involved in the plot, and all adherents of Romanism were subjected to persecution. Roman Catholics were forbidden to go five miles from their houses without a licence. Such as were not householders were expelled from London. An Act was passed which excluded all Roman Catholics from Parliament (30 Car. II. st. 2). The Commons were prorogued

Persecution of Romanists.
A.D. 1678.

CHAP.

XVI.

James
supported
by the
bishops.
A.D. 1680.

whilst discussing a "Bill of Exclusion," setting aside James's claim to the throne. This bill was actually passed in 1680, but was thrown out in the Lords, where the bishops, of course, maintained the principle of divine right. The attitude of the spiritual peers at this crisis completed the restoration of the ancient alliance of court and Church. The Commons, on the other hand, though unshaken in their loyalty to Church principles, were inclined to regard the nonconformists as their natural allies in their campaign against Romanism.

Discoveries
of plots.

The example of Titus Oates was an easy one to follow, and the country was now continually disturbed by fresh discoveries of politico-religious conspiracies. The year 1683 disclosed a Presbyterian scheme to murder Charles and the Duke of York. This conspiracy (known as the "Meal Tub Plot") was probably invented by the Romanists as a set-off to the disclosures of Oates. The "Rye House Plot" appears to have been a genuine conspiracy, devised by Shaftesbury to effect these purposes. The revolutionary plot which brought Lord Russell to the scaffold proposed to upset the Government by less sanguinary measures. The general feeling of insecurity to some extent lessened the antagonism towards James, and on his brother's death he was recognized as the lawful successor to the throne.

Such is the political aspect of the Church history of this reign. The Church had resumed its former attitude of antagonism to the Commons, and had somewhat impaired its popularity. The prelates were still devoted to the chimeras of divine right and passive obedience—theories which were sadly disparaged by the character of the present sovereign, and were hopelessly

shattered by the tyrannical conduct of his successor. The social aspect of England during this period appears, at first sight, fit to be depicted only in the darkest colours. The influence of a dissolute court, and the reaction from the gloomy Pharisaism of the interregnum, combined to lower the standard of public morals throughout the country. Profane swearing and blasphemy, gaming and duelling, were fast on the increase, and the lives of the clergy were not always uncontaminated by this widespread infection. Nevertheless, powerful if unobtrusive influences were operating to counteract this "overflowing of ungodliness." Each of the two religious schools had recently contributed its quota to English devotional literature, and Hammond's "Practical Catechism" and Baxter's "Saint's Everlasting Rest" were both widely circulated. Missionary zeal expressed itself in the establishment of the first Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and in the assiduous exertions of Mr. Boyle, its president, to procure translations of the Bible of 1611, for diffusion in foreign parts. Large sums of money appear to have been subscribed for the restoration and embellishment of the churches and cathedrals which had suffered in the period of confusion. Religion, if not widely diffused, seems to have gone deeper, and produced more practical results than in many more favourable epochs.

CHAP.
XVI.

Prevalence
of im-
morality.

Counter-
acting
influences.

Intellectual kept pace and co-operated with religious activity. At the head of the Church there appeared a galaxy of divines of extraordinary ability. Cosin, Sanderson, Gauden, and Walton have been already mentioned. The Caroline episcopate included also Jeremy Taylor, the most learned and eloquent of English writers; and Pearson, the author of the treatise

The age of
great
divines.

CHAP.
XVI.

on the Creed. In its priesthood were Barrow and South, the one the most erudite, the other certainly the wittiest of our homilists; and Bull, the author of the "Defensio Fidei Nicenæ." By these mighty doctors the Calvinism which had tainted the Church since 1558 was exposed in its true colours, and this gloomy parody on Augustinian theology was at last seldom accepted outside the confines of Dissenting sects.

Rise of the
Latitudina-
rians.

Side by side with these representatives of orthodoxy, there was growing up a new school of thinkers, the congeners of the modern Broad Church party. The "Latitudinarians" were opposed to the exaction of strict conformity, and professed the most liberal views as to the possibility of salvation. It is the glory of this school that its teaching hastened the extinction of that spirit of intolerance which characterized many of the orthodox Anglicans, and burnt more fiercely in the breasts of the Protestant sectaries. Unfortunately this toleration was often prompted not so much by charity as by haziness of religious principle. To the teaching of these divines must be ascribed those varieties of heresy and unbelief which infected the Church of the eighteenth century. The Latitudinarians thus exercised a weighty influence, both for good and for evil, on the fortunes of the Church and the religious sentiments of the whole nation. Chillingworth, a great logician and controversialist, who embraced Romanism for a time and wrote "The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way" in 1637, may be regarded as the founder of this school of thought. In the present reign it had several adherents of the highest intellectual capacity. Foremost among these were Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Patrick, and Henry More.

CHAPTER XVII.

James II. to George I.

A.D. 1685-1714.

James promises to support the Church—His liberation of the victims of the "Supremacy Act"—His relations with Rome—The coronation—The new Parliament—James's retention of the Romanist officers—The judges decide in favour of the dispensing power—It is used to restore Romanism—Resistance of the clergy—Dr. Sharp's sermon—The High Commission Court revived—Sancroft excuses himself from attendance—Bishop Compton suspended by the Commission—The "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience"—Effects of its publication among Churchmen—And Dissenters—Tyranny exercised at Cambridge—And at Oxford—Manipulation of corporations and lords-lieutenants—The clergy are to read the "Declaration of Indulgence"—The petition of the seven bishops—The Declaration not read by the clergy—The bishops in the Tower—Acquittal of the bishops—The Commission employed against the non-compliant clergy—The invitation to William of Orange—James in consultation with the bishops—They refuse a declaration of abhorrence—William at Exeter—Is William to be regent or king?—The Settlement—Enforcement of the oath of allegiance—Deprivation of non-jurors—Ken and other eminent nonjurors—The Government accepted as *de facto*, not *de jure*—The Church under William III.—The "Toleration Bill"—The "Bill for Union"—Thrown out by loyal Churchmen in the Commons—The king forced to summon Convocation—The commission of revision—Convocation refuses its sanction—Tillotson's encroachments on the Church's liberties—The Convocation controversy—Convocation again allowed to meet—The Lower at issue with the Upper House—Foundation of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G.—The Church under Queen Anne—Abolition of the committee for preferments—Restitution of the first-fruits and tenths—Queen Anne's Bounty fund—Convocation—The sacramental test—The "Act against Occasional Conformity"—The "Schism Bill"—The "Church in danger" cry—Dr. Sacheverell—Popularity of Anglican principles—Provision for new churches—Literary productions of the reign—The negotiations with the German Protestants.

ON his accession, James assured the Council of his intention to protect the Church, as the bulwark of the monarchy and the champion of loyal principles. It was a well-deserved compliment, for it was the Church's sup-

James promises to support the Church.

CHAP.
XVII.

His libera-
tion of the
victims
of the
"Supre-
macy Act."
April 18.

His rela-
tions with
Rome.

The coro-
nation.
April 23.

The new

port of the doctrine of "hereditary right" that had caused the collapse of the "Bill of Exclusion" and the "Regency Bill." The manœuvre of affecting concern for aggrieved Dissenters to secure concessions to the Romanists had been adopted repeatedly by Charles II. James eventually made this his settled policy. Already he had cemented a friendship with the celebrated William Penn, with the view of uniting the interests of the Quakers and the Roman Catholics, the two religious parties which refused the oath of supremacy. The result of this alliance was an order for the release of all who had been imprisoned on this account. Some fifteen hundred Quakers and a large number of Romanists thus recovered their liberty.

The accession of the papist sovereign excited little enthusiasm at Rome, for James maintained his brother's policy of venal subservience to France, where the Pope was embroiled with Louis XIV. on the subject of the Gallican liberties. Innocent XI. saw, moreover, that the doctrine of absolutism was not calculated to reinstate the Roman faith in the affections of England. Throughout the struggle of the next five years, Rome showed no sympathy for James's policy. "Every letter which went from the Vatican to Whitehall recommended patience, moderation, and respect for the prejudices of the English people."¹

On the second Sunday after Charles's death, Mass was ostentatiously celebrated in the king's chapel. At the coronation Sancroft was directed to omit the Communion Service and the ceremony of presenting the sovereign with an English translation of the Bible. Bribery and corruption were used to secure a Commons

¹ Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. i. p. 365. In 1688 Innocent's hatred of France induced him to contribute money towards the expense of William's expedition : see Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, i. 222.

well affected to the throne. James expressed himself satisfied with the results. A resolution was, however, passed in this new House, expressing fervent attachment to the Anglican system, and demanding the execution of the penal laws against nonconformity. The king's indignation induced the House to withdraw this resolution. It did so with a significant expression of confidence in his majesty's recent promise to protect the Church.

CHAP.
XVII.
Parliament.

Monmouth's insurrection received no countenance from the clergy, and Bishops Mew and Fell gave important assistance to the royal forces. Good Bishop Ken was assiduous in relieving the sufferings of the prisoners, and it was owing to the entreaties of the canons of Winchester that Alice Lisle's sentence was commuted. In the regiments hastily levied to resist Monmouth, there were several officers of the proscribed faith. Their case gave the king his first opportunity of overriding the "Test Act." When Parliament met, he announced his intention of keeping up a large armed force, and retaining the Romanist officers. This speech excited great apprehension. The officers might be employed to subvert the constitution in Church and State. The standing army recalled the hateful period of Puritan oppression. Compton Bishop of London, the tutor of the two princesses, spoke boldly against James's policy, declaring in the name of the whole episcopate that the king's conduct endangered the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of England. So great was the excitement that the king was forced to prorogue Parliament. Compton was deprived of the deanery of the Chapel Royal, and his name was struck off the list of Privy Councillors.

Nov. 9.
James's
retention
of the
Romanist
officers.

James's hopes lay in that romantic doctrine of loyalty

CHAP.
XVII.

which had been promulgated by the Tories and High Churchmen of his father's time. The dispensing power of the sovereign was still accredited by many. The king determined first to set this prerogative on an unassailable footing, and then to use it to re-establish Romanism. The trial of Sir Edward Hales, an officer who had been converted to Romanism, was got up with this end in view. His servant played the part of informer, and claimed the penalty of £500 awarded by the statute. Hales pleaded that royal letters patent authorized him to retain his commission. The bench of judges had been previously manipulated by the king. Lord Chief Justice Herbert gave it as the opinion of eleven judges out of twelve that the king might lawfully dispense with penal statutes in particular cases and for special reasons of grave importance.

The judges decide in favour of the dispensing power. June, 1686.

It is used to restore Romanism.

This verdict was utilized as establishing the king's right to ignore the "Test Act." Romanists were admitted to civil, military, and even ecclesiastical offices. Four Roman Catholic peers, and Petre the vice-provincial of the English Jesuits, were sworn of the Privy Council. John Massey, a Roman Catholic and a layman, was made Dean of Christ Church. The bishopric of Oxford was given to Samuel Parker, who was at heart a Romanist. Obadiah Walker, a pervert, was allowed to retain the mastership of University College, and to celebrate the Roman rites in his chapel. Processions of Roman priests appeared in the streets, and the religious fraternities were re-established. Three vicars apostolic were received as bishops *in partibus*. A colony of Benedictines was attached to S. James's Chapel; the Jesuits established a large public school at the Savoy; the Franciscans settled at Lincoln's Inn.

Resistance

But strong as was their attachment to the principle

of absolutism, the clergy would not suffer it to be used as a stalking-horse against the Church. A few bishops might be found abetting James's unconstitutional proceedings, having received their promotion for that purpose.¹ But the parish clergy almost unanimously followed the lead of Ken, Frampton, and Sherlock. The London pulpits rang with denunciations of Romanism, and the cry was taken up in every part of England. Pamphlets against Popery were issued by thousands at the universities, where the press was free of royal censorship. The king used his power as supreme ordinary to prohibit preaching on controverted points of doctrine. Sancroft consented to issue this royal injunction, but it produced little effect. Dr. Sharp, Dean of Norwich and Rector of S. Giles-in-the-Fields, delivered a discourse against Romanism which attracted the king's attention. Compton, his diocesan, received an order from Sunderland to suspend him. He courageously declined to do so. He privately requested Sharp not to appear in the pulpit for the present, and reported to the king that the preacher was prepared to give him "all reasonable satisfaction." James's wrath was thus diverted from the priest to the bishop, who was already in ill odour for his speech in the House of Lords. This episode was productive of important consequences. It will be remembered that the High Commission Court of Elizabeth had made itself specially odious to the Puritans, and had been abolished in July, 1641. The accession of Charles II. had reinstated such courts spiritual as the Court of Arches, the Consistory courts,

CHAP.
XVII.
of the
clergy.

Dr. Sharp's
sermon.

June 14,
1686.

¹ Parker of Oxford and Cartwright of Chester were pre-eminent as episcopal parasites. Crewe of Durham and Sprat of Rochester were men of similar stamp. The latter seems to have hoped to get the archbishopric of York. This piece of preferment was kept vacant for more than three years. It is said that James waited for a good opportunity to give it to Petre.

CHAP.
XVII.

The High
Commis-
sion Court
revived.
July, 1686.

Sancroft
~~was~~
himself
from
attendance.

Sept. 3,
1686.

Bishop
Compton
suspended
by the
Commis-
sion.

and the archidiaconal courts, but had declared this notorious engine of royal oppression incapable of existence (13 Car. II.). James, in defiance of this Act, now announced that he had entrusted the government of the Church to seven commissioners, who were directed to use the seal of the old court. They were furnished with the largest powers for purposes of visitation. Their jurisdiction was to extend not only to the dioceses and universities, but to every college and school in the kingdom. At their head was the detestable Jeffreys, the Lord Chancellor, whose presence and assent was declared to be necessary in all proceedings. Three episcopal names were included in the Commission—Sancroft, the primate; Sprat, Bishop of Rochester; and Crewe, Bishop of Durham. Sprat and Crewe were notorious as parasites who would do all that royalty required. Sancroft, on the other hand, though a devoted loyalist, was a more devoted Churchman. He had thought it right to execute the king's order in the matter of the "Injunctions." But even his overstrained loyalty could not accept a tribunal illegal by origin and manifestly designed to compass the ruin of the Church. It is disappointing to find that he did not openly denounce the Commission. He merely begged to be excused attendance on the plea of ill health and numerous engagements. The hollowness of the pretext was sufficiently discernible. James relieved the primate from attendance at the Privy Council, and afterwards made Cartwright a Commissioner. Compton was cited before the six commissioners. It was found difficult to prove, even in a court which had Jeffreys for president, that the bishop had in any way transgressed. Three voted for an acquittal, and it was only by menacing the lord treasurer with deprivation that the king at last

secured a majority. The recalcitrant bishop was suspended, and Sprat and Crewe were empowered to administer his diocese.

CHAP.
XVII.

Baulked in his hopes of using the loyalist clergy as his tools, the king made up his mind to effect a great coalition of Romanists and Dissenters. In January, 1687, concessions were made to the Presbyterians of Scotland. In March the Council were apprised that a full indulgence was to be given to all kinds of religious opinions. Hitherto the most remorseless of persecutors, the king now professed to believe that all statutes to enforce conformity were opposed to the spirit of Christianity. In April these new opinions were proclaimed in the celebrated "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience." The king herein expressed his wish that all his subjects were Romanists. This being impossible, the attitude of all religionists was to be one of mutual toleration. The Anglican clergy were merely to be maintained in the enjoyment of their possessions and free exercise of their religion. All assemblies for worship were to be tolerated, all penal laws bearing on religion suspended, all tests—not excepting the oaths of supremacy and allegiance—dispensed with. Such persons as had incurred penalties in the matter of religion were pardoned. This Declaration was issued by virtue of the dispensing power. The king affected to make no doubt of the concurrence of the two Houses of Parliament, "when we shall think it convenient for them to meet."

The
"Declara-
tion for
Liberty
of Con-
science."
April 4,
1687.

It is singular to find the nineteenth-century theory of religious toleration forestalled by a ruler so cruel and unprincipled as James II. But that the principle of the Declaration has survived neither proves that it was a proper measure for the year 1687, nor palliates

CHAP.
XVII.Effects of
the publi-
cation
among
Church-
men.And Dis-
senters.Tyranny
exercised
at Cam-
bridge.
Feb. 1687.

the illegality of the king's procedure. The Declaration was odious, both as assuming a royal power to cancel the legislation of Parliament, and as a transparent device to fill the offices of state with Romanists, and so secure the restoration of Popery. Charles had been forced to relinquish a scheme of toleration of far narrower scope. It is not surprising that the Declaration roused the country to a paroxysm of indignation. The court party vainly tried to get up addresses of thanks from the clergy. Five obsequious bishops expressed their gratitude for his majesty's promise to protect the Church. But the parish priests, almost to a man, refused to sign such manifestoes. The Dissenters, however, with a few notable exceptions, gladly abetted the king's policy. Some sixty addresses came from the nonconforming congregations, filled with the most ardent expressions of loyalty. "Anabaptists, Presbyterians, and Quakers promiscuously crowded the royal presence. . . James was compared to Cyrus, to Moses, to several other deliverers of the people of God in the ancient world; his piety was praised, his moderation extolled, his magnanimity raised to the skies."¹ With more consistency Baxter, Howe, Kiffin, Bunyan, and a few other eminent Dissenters, denounced the Declaration as insidious and illegal.

Meantime the commissioners were facilitating the aggressions of royalty at the universities. To Cambridge James had sent a Benedictine monk named Allan Francis, to be admitted a Master of Arts. The Acts of Parliament required that none should proceed to this degree without taking the oath of supremacy and a similar pledge termed the oath of obedience. Francis's religion forbade him to accept this requisition. The

¹ Macpherson, i. 436, 437: see also Kettlewell's Life, 62, 63.

academical body respectfully submitted to the king that it would be illegal to confer the degree. For this Dr. Pechell, the vice-chancellor, was summoned, with eight representatives of the senate, before the High Commission. Jeffreys conducted the trial with his wonted insolence and injustice. Dr. Pechell was deprived of the vice-chancellorship and suspended from the emoluments of his mastership. The eight representatives, one of whom was Isaac Newton, Professor of Mathematics, were dismissed with the admonition, "Go your way and sin no more," etc. Magdalen College, Oxford, was dealt with in similar fashion. On the death of their president, the king sent a letter to the collegiate body recommending the election of Anthony Farmer, a Cambridge man of disreputable character, formerly a Dissenter, and now of the Roman Communion. The law forbade the appointment of a Roman Catholic. The college statutes required the master to be a member of Magdalen or New College, and a person of good moral character. On these grounds the fellows begged the king to select some other nominee. No notice was taken of the request. The fellows met and elected Dr. Hough. They were summoned to Whitehall, where Dr. Fairfax was deprived of his fellowship for expressing a doubt as to the validity of the Commission. For Farmer the king now substituted a more respectable nominee in the person of Bishop Parker. But Parker was also ineligible as not belonging to New or Magdalen. The fellows declined to rescind their nomination of Hough. James himself visited the college, and employed Penn to urge the duty of submission. But neither king nor courtier could persuade the fellows to violate their statutes. A special commission was accordingly appointed to effect a visitation at Magda-

CHAP.
XVII.

And at
Oxford.

June, 1687.

CHAP.
XVII.

Nov. 16,
1687.

Manipulation of corporations and lords-lieutenants.
Dec. 12,
1687.

The clergy are to read the "Declaration of Indulgence."
May 4,
1688.

len. All the fellows but two were expelled, and their fate was shared by a number of the demies. Parker died soon afterwards, and the college was forthwith turned into a Roman seminary, under Bonaventure Giffard, Bishop of Madura.

In other quarters there was similar aggression. A committee of seven Privy Councillors was appointed to "regulate" those municipal corporations which returned members. A proclamation announced the king's intention to retain only such magistrates and lords-lieutenants as should support his policy. The latter received orders to supply the king with a list of such Romanists and Dissenters as appeared qualified for the bench and for militia commands. Half the lords-lieutenants refused compliance, and were at once dismissed from office.

The crisis was precipitated by the memorable events of May and June, 1688. On May 4 the notorious "Declaration of Indulgence" reappeared, prefaced by an order that the Church should give it publication. Every incumbent was to read it at the time of divine service on Sunday. In London and the suburbs it was to be read on May 20 and 27; in the provinces on June 3 and 10. The bishops were to distribute it, and see that their clergy complied with the requisition. The object of this proceeding was to crush and humiliate the chief antagonists of Romanism. The clergy who refused to read might be legally proceeded against by their diocesans. Those who read would appear to recognize its validity and approve of the king's designs. Everything depended on the attitude of the bishops, and seldom has the Church of England received such good service at the hands of her first order. Not even the loyalty of Sancroft could find excuse for compliance. Despite his theories of passive obedience, the primate

stood forward unhesitatingly as the champion of the outraged Church. Meetings of his suffragans and the leading London clergy were at once convened at Lambeth. It was agreed that it was not expedient that the clergy should read the Declaration. A petition was drawn up, stating that the "Declaration of Indulgence" was "founded on such a dispensing power as hath been often declared illegal in Parliament," and that the bishops could not, "in prudence, honour, or conscience so far make themselves parties to it, as the distribution of it all over the nation and the solemn publication of it over and again even in God's house must amount to."

May 18.

Sancroft wrote the petition in his own hand. After his signature appear the autographs of W. Asaph (Lloyd), Fran. Ely (Turner), Io. Cicester (Lake), Tho. Bath and Wells (Ken), Tho. Petriburgens (White), Jon. Bristol (Trelawney). Six¹ other bishops, who had not been present, appended their "approbo" in the course of the following week. But it was necessary to act on the spur of the moment. The petitioners² made their way that night to Whitehall, and put the document in James's hands. The king was no less astonished than irritated. Accustomed to regard the Church as the vindicator of absolutism, he characterized the petition as "strange words," such as he did not "expect from the Church of England." But the bishops were unmoved. Sunday, May 20, came, the day when the London clergy were to read the Declaration. Four incumbents only in the City complied. Bishop Sprat, Dean of Westminster, read it, but the abbey was emptied ere he had finished. The country clergy followed the good example of their

The
petition of
the seven
bishops.The
Declara-
tion not
read by the
clergy.

¹ Those of London, Norwich, Gloucester, Salisbury, Winchester, and Exeter.

² Sancroft did not accompany them. He had not had access to the royal presence since his declining to serve on the High Commission. Ken and Trelawney appear to have been the chief spokesmen.

CHAP.

XVII.

London brethren when their day of trial came. Not more than two hundred incumbents in all complied.

James, however, was not convinced of the futility of his policy. He resolved to revenge himself on the bishops. Acting on the advice of Jeffreys, he made their petition the ground for an action for libel. The bishops pleaded their privilege as peers, and refused to enter into recognizances. They were thereupon committed to the Tower. The public excitement at this juncture was intense. The river banks were thronged by a sympathetic crowd, and the barge which conveyed the bishops was hailed with vociferous cheers and prayers for their lordships' welfare.¹ Their prison was attended like the presence-chamber of royalty, and the trial at Westminster is said to have been witnessed by half the nobility of England. The absurdity of calling the bishops' petition a malicious libel must have been patent to all unprejudiced minds. Nevertheless, two of the four judges had the audacity to decide against the accused, and three of the jury stood out for a conviction so obstinately that the verdict of "Not guilty" was not brought into court till ten o'clock the next morning.

The
bishops
in the
Tower.

June 29

Acquittal
of the
bishops.

Ere the close of this memorable day, a formal invitation was despatched to William of Orange. Among the seven names attached to it was that of Bishop Compton. The universal rejoicing which followed the acquittal of the bishops might have warned James of his danger. He was still bent, however, on punishing the contumacious clergy. The Court of High Commission received orders to collect the names of all who had neglected to read the Declaration. The chancellors, archdeacons, etc., were charged by the court to give information. But scarcely one of these officers sent

The Com-
mission
employed
against the
non-com-
pliant
clergy.

¹ Burnet's Own Times, p. 469.

in a return. Bishop Sprat foresaw the impending catastrophe, and resigned his place on the Commission.

CHAP.
XVII.

In September the king's eyes were rudely opened by information of the overtures to William. The emergency drove him to seek assistance where he had least right to expect it—in the Anglican episcopate. Despite the wrongs inflicted on the Church, the bishops, with few exceptions, still maintained the principle of divine right. They were prepared to accept William's co-operation in restoring the national liberties should the king continue his hateful policy. But to the last they scouted the idea of dethroning the unworthy sovereign. Probably Compton himself had as yet no thought of raising William above the rank of regent. By the advice of the bishops, James dissolved the High Commission Court, restored the ejected fellows of Magdalene, and reinstated the disfranchised corporations. He even issued a proclamation promising to protect the English Church, and maintain the Act of Uniformity. But the time for conciliatory policy was past. William's manifesto was put into the king's hands. It asserted that he came at the request of the lords spiritual and temporal. Sancroft and other bishops indignantly vindicated the loyalty of the bench; Compton contrived to satisfy the king with an evasive answer. James required a counter manifesto asserting the bishops' "abhorrence" of William's design, but the demand was not complied with. Every hour enhanced the gravity of the situation, and the only effect of these consultations was to prejudice the populace against the bishops. They wisely declined further responsibility, and refused to give counsel without the co-operation of the temporal peers.¹ On November 5 William landed at Torbay.

The invitation to William of Orange.

James in consultation with the bishops.

They refuse a declaration of abhorrence.

¹ Clarendon Correspondence, ii. 501.

- CHAP. XVII. He marched unopposed to Exeter, and held a thanksgiving service in the cathedral. Bishop Lamplugh and the cathedral dignitaries discreetly absented themselves; but Burnet was equal to the occasion, and himself read the prince's declaration. James's flight paved the way for a convention of the lords spiritual and temporal. The mediation of the Prince of Orange was here unanimously accepted. An address was drawn up requesting him to take steps for calling a free Parliament, wherein measures should be taken for the defence of law, liberty, property, "and the Church of England in particular, with a due liberty to Protestant Dissenters."¹
- William at Exeter. Dec. 11. Sancroft and the ultra-loyalists urged that James ought to be treated as intellectually incapable, and the Prince of Orange nominated as his *custos regni*. But public feeling ran in favour of deposition. The Convention Parliament assembled to decide this issue. Sancroft absented himself. The regency had the support of twelve bishops, and narrowly escaped passing in the House of Lords. Two bishops only, Trelawney and Compton, voted in the majority which declared the throne vacant. The future confines of kingly prerogative were now determined by the "Declaration of Rights," an instrument which expounded the principles of the constitution in terms fatal to the absolutist doctrine. The sovereignty was definitely settled on William and Mary, and all who held benefices and academical offices were required to take a new oath of allegiance.
- Is William to be regent or king? Jan. 22, 1689. The Settlement. Feb. 1689. It is not surprising that this precipitate settlement was a stumbling-block to many consciences, and that several clergymen who had no love for James doubted whether the transfer of allegiance was justifiable. The Convention Parliament, however, insisted on the oath.
- Enforcement of

¹ Kennet, iii. 500; Echard's Revolution, 214.

It was to be taken by August 1, under penalty of a six months' suspension, to be followed, if the oath were still refused, by a summary deprivation. In March, 1689, two bishops had taken the oath in Parliament; Sancroft and eight others¹ had refused it. Thomas, Lake, and Cartwright died before the term of grace expired. The remaining six were of the same mind on the fatal February 1, and suffered deprivation. Four of the immortal seven, who had so nobly maintained the Church's liberties in the summer of 1688, were thus relegated to poverty and disgrace. Four hundred incumbents shared their fate. Many of them were men of great ability. Of their earnestness the sacrifice of their emoluments for conscience sake is an unassailable proof. It may be fairly said that the Church was thus deprived of the very pick of her clergy. They became the backbone of a "Jacobite" faction, and the founders of a politico-religious schism, which lasted for a hundred years. The course adopted with the nonjurors was mainly attributable² to the influence of the Dissenters. They had themselves leagued with the Romanizing James, and left the bishops and clergy to defend the cause of the Reformation. They now, however, assumed to themselves the merit of the Revolution, and audaciously attributed the conscientious scruples of the defenders of the faith to "Popish" influence. They were actively abetted by Burnet. The greatest loss to the Church was Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, the most able, devout, and popular prelate of his generation. He was given an extra year of grace, but continued unable to reconcile his conscience to the new view of monarchy, and was accordingly ejected in 1691. Beve-

CHAP.

XVII.

the oath of
allegiance.Depriva-
tion of
nonjurors.
Feb. 1690.Ken and
other
eminent
nonjurors.¹ Ken, Turner, Frampton, Lloyd, White, Thomas, Lake, and Cartwright.² Evelyn, iii. 281.

CHAP.
XVII.

ridge refused to accept a see thus improperly vacated. Kidder reluctantly consented to take it. Ken contented himself with issuing a protest against the intrusion of his successor. To the nonjuring schism, fostered by Turner, Lloyd, and White,¹ he gave no countenance. Archbishop Sancroft at first accepted his fate with less equanimity. He ceded a commission to three suffragans to consecrate Burnet. He refused, however, to quit Lambeth Palace till removed by legal process. He then retired to his native place in Suffolk, and there lived contentedly on fifty pounds a year, having delegated his archiepiscopal powers to Lloyd, a more active nonjuror. He died in 1693. In the second order of clergy the four most eminent victims were Jeremy Collier, the Church historian; Leslie, the great controversialist; George Hickes, Dean of Worcester, afterwards consecrated by the nonjuring bishops to the see of Thetford; and John Kettlewell, a scholar and divine of some repute. Dr. Sherlock, the master of the Temple, who had advocated the doctrine of passive obedience in his "Case of Resistance," deserted the nonjurors after a short suspension. His apology for accepting the *de facto* Government was published under the title "Case of Allegiance due to a Sovereign Power." The lay nonjurors numbered in their ranks Henry Dodwell, the Camden Professor at Oxford; and the devout

¹ These three bishops consecrated Hickes and Wagstaffe as bishops of Thetford and Ipswich in A.D. 1694. The numbers of the nonjurors were kept up by the senseless policy which forced on the clergy the "abjuration oath," declaring William king *de jure*, A.D. 1701. In A.D. 1713 Hickes and certain Scotch bishops consecrated Jeremy Collier and two others. A schism broke out among the nonjurors in A.D. 1718, owing to Collier's attempt to restore the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. Collier's party were called "Usagers," a word akin to the modern term "Ritualists." Reunion was effected in A.D. 1733, but fresh schisms occurring the nonjurors dwindled in numbers, and were extinct before the end of the century. William Law appears to have been the last eminent person belonging to the nonjurors.

Robert Nelson, the author of the "Fasts and Festivals." In justice to the Government it must be remarked that care was taken to make the oath palatable to these weak consciences. Nothing was said about the title of the new sovereigns. The form was simply, "I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear to bear true allegiance to their majesties King William and Queen Mary."¹

CHAP.
XVII.

The Government accepted as "de facto," not "de jure."

The clergy who took the oath in 1689 could justify the proceeding on the ground taken by Nicolson, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle: "Whenever a sovereign *de facto* is universally submitted to and recognized by all the three estates, I must believe that person to be lawful and rightful monarch of this kingdom, who alone has a just title to my allegiance."²

The two succeeding reigns are less interesting to the student, and may be quickly passed over. William III. was a Presbyterian, and had the prejudices of a Puritan in matters of Church ritual. His knowledge of the Church of England was derived from Gilbert Burnet, an intriguing politician of Latitudinarian views, who had retired to the Continent on the accession of James, and become chaplain at the Dutch court. He was now raised to the see of Salisbury. The new king's declaration had promised to "endeavour a good agreement between the Church of England and all Protestant Dissenters," and he answered the addresses of Dissenting delegates by undertaking to attempt a union of his Protestant subjects "on those terms wherein all the reformed Churches agree." This object he tried to secure by measures necessarily displeasing to faithful Churchmen. So far indeed as toleration was concerned, men's minds were gradually approaching that view of

The Church under William III.

¹ The old oath of allegiance bound the subject to the sovereign as "true and lawful" king or queen.

² Nicolson, *Epistolary Correspondence*, ii. 387.

CHAP.
XVII.

The
"Tolera-
tion Bill."
March,
1689.

religious differences which is now generally accepted. Throne and Commons had each been driven into alliance, now with the Nonconformists, now with the Romanists. The Church itself had received occasional assistance from the anti-Papal animus of the Puritans. There was a general feeling that religious difference was only intolerable when it tended to foster the cause of disloyalty or of tyranny. A "Toleration Bill," therefore, passed both Houses easily, and was considered satisfactory by the staunchest Churchmen. This bill relieved Dissenting laymen from the pressure of those Acts which had made absence from divine service a crime. It provided that such Acts should not be enforced where the nonconformist would testify his loyalty by accepting the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and his Protestantism by signing the declaration against transubstantiation. The arrangement for extending toleration to the Dissenting ministers is, to modern thinking, an anomaly. No minister was to be prohibited from exercising his functions, provided he signed the greater part of the Thirty-nine Articles. The portions he was allowed to demur to were those which asserted the power of the Church to regulate ceremonies, the soundness of the Book of Homilies and the Ordination Service, and the efficacy of Infant Baptism. For the Quakers there was a special proviso of indulgence. These sectaries were to be undisturbed, provided they signed a declaration against transubstantiation, promised fidelity to the Government, and professed a faith in certain prominent doctrines of Christianity—the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and the inspiration of Scripture. Such were the conditions on which the sects secured toleration. They were usually accepted

with cheerfulness, and the concession appears to have given no offence to Churchmen.

CHAP.
XVII.

But with the "Toleration Bill" came a measure which could not be regarded so complacently. The "Bill for Union" was designed by the Whigs to revolutionize the Anglican system, on the pretext of giving Nonconformity further indulgence. For subscription to the Articles this bill proposed to substitute the following confession:—"I do approve of the doctrine and worship and government of the Church of England by law established, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and I promise in the exercise of my ministry to preach and practise according thereunto." Having made this confession, any Presbyterian minister was to be capacitated for holding Church preferment, provided he submitted to a bishop's imposition of hands. By another clause, the sign of the cross in Baptism, the employment of sponsors, and the practice of kneeling at the Eucharist were to be made optional. Finally a commission was demanded of thirty divines of royal appointment to revise the Liturgy, the canons, and the constitution of the ecclesiastical courts. This bill received the support of Bishop Compton in the Lords, and was there carried by a small majority. It was to the House of Commons that the Anglican system owed its preservation at this crisis. The nonconforming members may have been convinced, as Lord Macaulay urges, that their ministers were better off as blatant leaders of separatists than as unobtrusive pastors in poor benefices. But this does not account for the rejection of the bill, for the majority of the members were not Puritans. It was thrown out by the loyal Churchmen in the House, the men who, as Bishop Burnet says, "were much offended with the bill, as

The "Bill
for Union."

Thrown out
by loyal
Churchmen
in the
Commons.

CHAP.
XVII.

containing matters relative to the Church in which the representative body of the clergy had not been so much as advised with."

The king
forced to
~~submit~~
Convoca-
tion.

Thus reminded of the existence of Convocation, which had been ignored since the irregular summons of the Convention Parliament, the king decided that the clerical representatives should be summoned in the usual way with the next Parliament. Meanwhile a commission of ten bishops and twenty other divines was to be appointed to prepare a scheme of revision for their acceptance. Dean Tillotson's list of changes which would "probably be made" by the commission shows what sort of improvements were desired by the Latitudinarians. It includes the items, "all ceremonies to be made indifferent;" "assent and consent to be taken away; a promise to submit to the doctrine and discipline of the Church substituted;" "foreign orders to be admitted;" "a form of conditional ordination to be adopted." The prospect of these revolutionary measures drove all High Churchmen from the commission. The residue met to endorse a sweeping scheme of alteration, which was to be recommended to Convocation. The Prayer-book was to be mutilated into accord with Latitudinarianism. "Priest" was to be altered to "minister," the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick struck out, kneeling at the Holy Communion made optional, and almost all the Collects were to be removed in favour of Bishop Patrick's own compositions. Fortunately the parochial clergy were roused to the importance of the pending issue. The returns for Convocation were watched with the greatest interest. They produced an assembly determined that the Church should not be undermined under the insidious pretext of "comprehension." By its firm-

The com-
mission of
revision.

Nov., 1689.
Convoca-

ness the levelling spirit of the courtier prelates was successfully resisted. It ceded nothing more than a vote of thanks to his majesty for his care of the Church of England, and Dr. Tillotson, now Archbishop designate of Canterbury, vowed that he would have nothing more to do with Convocations.

CHAP
XVII.

tion re-
fuses its
sanction.

It may certainly be doubted whether the revolutionary measures of the party now in the ascendant would not have been more detrimental to the new dynasty than to the Church. The nonjuring party, which already numbered some of the most eminent English divines, would have been furnished with a just pretext for regarding the Establishment as schismatic, and doubtless half the country would have renounced the new dynasty in defence of the old form of faith. The whole scheme was as discreditable to the policy of Tillotson and Burnet as to their Churchmanship. As it was, the nonjuror party discredited itself by a policy of non-intervention. Its leaders stood sullenly aloof from the fray, seemingly indifferent whether the Church was Presbyterianized or not.

Tillotson presided three years at Canterbury. The northern primacy was given to Dr. Sharp, a far worthier son of the Church. Tillotson was renowned as a rhetorician, but his *régime* was neither popular nor advantageous. It is plain that he cared nothing for the rights, and little for the doctrinal principles of the Anglican Church. Anarchists, both political and religious, often prove the greatest tyrants when placed in office. Tillotson, convinced that Convocation would not accommodate him by levelling down, took care that it should not be allowed to meet. The principle of governing the Church by royal "Injunctions" was revived, and a few courtier bishops assumed that

Tillotson's
encroach-
ments
on the
Church's
liberties
A.D. 1691-
1694.

CHAP.
XVII.

A.D. 1694.

The "Con-
vocation
Contro-
versy."
A.D. 1697.

Convoca-
tion again
allowed
to act.

The Lower
at issue
with the
Upper
House.

direction which should have been in the hands of the whole clerical body. This state of affairs continued when Tillotson was succeeded by Tenison. It at last gave rise to the "Convocation Controversy."

Sir Bartholomew Shower, a Jacobite, began this controversy by publishing his "Letter to a Convocation Man." Herein it was urged not only that the growth of heretical opinions at this time demanded the meeting of Convocation, but that the king had no more power to silence the clerical than the lay representatives, and that it was really the law that Convocations should meet as often as Parliaments. Dr. Wake answered the "Letter" Atterbury wrote on the side of Shower; the opposite cause was maintained by Burnet, Hody, and Kennett. Though the legal prerogatives of Convocation were not accurately stated by its champions, the injustice under which the clergy suffered was sufficiently plain. The populace sided with them, and the Government dared not continue the anomaly. The writ summoning Convocation was reluctantly issued in February, 1701. It was soon apparent that the Lower House was animated by no friendly feelings towards the Whig bishops, who had so ill defended the Church's liberties, and that its rights would be asserted on the grounds taken by Shower and Atterbury. It would not be prorogued at Tenison's bidding, arguing that the archbishops had no more right to prorogue the Lower House than the Lord Chancellor to prorogue the Commons. It undertook a subject of conference, *proprio motu*, to be afterwards laid before the Upper House, just as a Bill is sent from the Commons to the Lords. The dispute in connection with this assertion of rights lasted till the end of the reign.

While William's inability to appreciate the position of the English Church was thus fruitful in controversies, the change of dynasty was productive of happier results in the encouragement given to the cause of morality and Christian devotion. With James II. there passed away for a time the licentiousness and profanity which for many years had disgraced the English court. From the religious associations for reformation of manners and encouragement of devotion, which had been formed in the reign of Charles II., there now sprang two societies which still claim the support of Churchmen. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge dates its charter from 1698; its offshoot, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, from 1701. They owe their existence to the zeal of five devout men—Lord Guildford, Sir H. Mackworth, Justice Hook, Colonel Colchester, and Dr. Bray.

CHAP.
XVII.

Foundation
of the
S.P.C.K.
and S.P.G.

The prospect brightened on the accession of Anne. The new sovereign had been trained in the principles of the Church. Her intellect was inferior, but she was pious and liberal. She at once showed herself able to sympathize with the grievances of the working clergy. One of these was the method of disposing of patronage. William had, in the earlier part of his reign, allowed Queen Mary to appoint to ecclesiastical dignities as she wished, and she appears to have exercised her privilege with characteristic discretion. But after her death the king appointed a committee of six bishops, to which his patronage was entrusted, and preferment was henceforward the reward of Latitudinarian divinity and Whig politics. One of the first acts of Queen Anne was to relieve this commission of their functions. Archbishop Sharp was deputed to preach the coronation sermon, and a Whig

The Church
under
Queen
Anne.

A.D. 1694.

Abolition
of the
committee
for pre-
ferments.

CHAP.
XVII.

minority in the new Parliament argued that Toryism had regained its ascendancy in the constituencies as well as at court. In 1705 the military successes of Marlborough and the extraordinary influence of his wife at court restored the Whig party to place and royal favour for a while. But the case of Dr. Sacheverell was sufficient to rekindle a flame of Anglican enthusiasm. The Parliament of 1710 was strong in Tories and High Churchmen, and that of 1713, though containing much of the Whig element, was even more conspicuous than its predecessor for its zealous regard for the Church's interests. At no time was the Church more prosperous and more useful than during the reign of Queen Anne.

Restitution
of the
first-fruits
and tenths.
A.D. 1704.

The incident in this reign of most interest to well-wishers of the English Church is the act of justice by which the queen restored the first-fruits and tenths of benefices, which Henry VIII. and all succeeding sovereigns (with the honourable exception of Mary) had treated as a royal perquisite. This proceeding, accompanied by the carriage in Parliament of a Bill so far repealing the "Statute of Mortmain" as to allow testamentary benefactions for the augmentation of benefices, was the first attempt to cope with a crying scandal in the Establishment. Ever since the Reformation England had been disgraced by the poverty of her clergy and the conferring of Holy Orders on men of little learning and low social status. The establishment of the fund known as Queen Anne's Bounty, for the amelioration of poor benefices, marks the beginning of a new era in the clerical status. The profession of a clergyman soon became that of an educated gentleman.

Queen
Anne's
Bounty
fund.

Convoca-
tion.

The proceedings in Convocation throughout this

reign gave proof that William's attempt to silence the voice of the Church had not been forgotten. The Lower House continually discredited itself by factious opposition to the dignitaries. A "Representation" made to the Upper House in February, 1704, animadverted with just severity on the negligence of the bishops, and consequent upgrowth of abuses and irregularities. But the spirit in which such reflections were made was that of censoriousness rather than of godly zeal. So offensive to the queen was the tone of the Lower House that she sanctioned its irregular prorogation by the archbishop during the sitting of Parliament. After the Tory reaction Convocation was allowed to resume its functions, but the queen sent a catalogue of subjects on which it was free to debate. These were—(1.) The growth of infidelity and heresy. In connection with this subject Convocation censured the doctrine of William Whiston, a crazy Cambridge professor, who gave the so-called "Apostolical Constitutions" the dignity of inspired Scriptures. (2.) The course of proceedings in excommunications. (3.) The preparation of forms for receiving converts from the Roman Church and for restoring the lapsed. (4.) Regulations as to the duty of rural deans. (5.) Forms for terriers of glebe lands. (6.) Regulations as to matrimonial licences. Practical results were attained in regard to these subjects in this Convocation and its successor of 1713. The last business done was the consideration of Dr. Clarke's Arian publications.

A.D. 1706.

A.D. 1711.

Although the "Toleration Act" had given the Non-conformists liberty to assemble for worship in their conventicles, the "Test Act" was still in force, compelling all officers, civil and military, to receive the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of

The sacramental
test.

CHAP.
XVII.

England. The existence of this test could not but tend to the disparagement of the sacrament, which was often received by rakes and sceptics as a "picklock to a place." It was nevertheless defended by the High Churchmen of the day, among whom Church principle too often took the form of ecclesiastical Toryism. The only abuse which they recognized in connexion with the test was its evasion by the "occasional conformists." Men who were really Dissenters were wont to qualify for office by communicating, and then continue to frequent conventicles. This inconsistency was made the most of by the Tory gentry. Three times in Anne's first Parliament the Commons passed bills against occasional conformity, fining officials who should attend a conventicle, and compelling them to qualify by the reception of the Holy Communion thrice a year. On each occasion the bill was rejected in the Lords, where Bishop Burnet opposed the revival of persecuting legislation as impolitic. So strong, however, was the feeling against the Dissenters in 1711 that this Bill was passed in both Houses without a division.

The "Act
against
Occasional
Con-
formity."

The
"Schism
Bill."

No less retrograde in tendency was the Act of 1713, suppressing Dissenting schools. By this Act every tutor and master might be summoned to show a certificate that he had received the Holy Communion within the last year. A subscription of conformity and a licence from the diocesan were also required. This Act would, in fact, have put Dissenting schoolmasters in the plight of the sequestered clergy in 1655, under Cromwell's memorable edict. It received the royal assent, but the queen's death prevented it from coming into operation.

In 1705-6 the rise of the Marlboroughs, and the consequent exclusion of High Churchmen from office,

produced in the country a jealous dread of Nonconformist encroachment, which attained the dignity of a panic. Everywhere the cry was heard, "The Church in danger." Dr. Drake's pamphlet, "The Memorial of the Church of England," was an incentive to this feeling of insecurity. So great was the excitement that a day was appointed for discussing in the Upper House whether the Church was in danger or not. Lord Rochester, the Bishop of London, and the Archbishop of York argued a state of peril from the establishment of an aggressive Presbyterianism in Scotland, from the immoral and infidel literature in circulation, and from the spread of Dissenting academies. Burnet and the Whig bishops denied that there was ground for alarm, and in this opinion a majority in both Houses concurred. The "Memorial" was denounced as a scandalous libel by a royal proclamation. All her Majesty's subjects were summoned to assist in the attempt to apprehend its printer. But it soon appeared that the country did not share the convictions of Parliament with regard to the Church's security.

CHAP.
XVII.
The
"Church in
danger"
cry.

An immense amount of pulpit and pamphlet eloquence was being expended at this time on the question of divine right and passive obedience. These two doctrines, which had necessarily been in abeyance during the reign of William, were not unfavourably received by the present sovereign. Blackhall, a Tory bishop, openly asserted them in a sermon before the queen, and defended them in a pamphlet controversy with Hoadly. The Whig ministers, unconscious of their unpopularity, determined that such teaching should be suppressed with a high hand.

The person selected to be the martyr of Toryism was Dr. Henry Sacheverell, fellow of Magdalen, Oxford, Dr. Sacheverell.

CHAP.
XVII.

Nov. 1709.

A.D. 1710.

Popularity
of Angli-
can prin-
ciples.

and chaplain of S. Saviour's. In a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor, and sold largely, Sacheverell showed how the Church was "in perils among *false brethren*," to wit, those ministers who had betrayed the Church to the Dissenters, and were still menacing both the civil and the ecclesiastical rights of the clergy. On the complaint of Mr. Dolben in the House of Commons, it was voted that Sacheverell should be impeached before the Lords for the following high crimes and misdemeanours:—(1.) Asserting that the Revolution was effected by means odious and unjustifiable. (2.) Condemning that toleration which had been sanctioned by law. (3.) Asserting that the Church was in danger. (4.) Maligning the queen's advisers as false brethren and traitors to the constitution. The trial in Westminster Hall began on February 27. On March 20 a majority of the peers (sixty-nine against fifty-two) voted Sacheverell guilty. In this vote seven bishops concurred. It was decreed by way of penalty that the offensive sermon should be burnt by the common hangman, and that Sacheverell should be suspended from preaching for three years. A motion that he should be incapacitated for preferment was defeated. Throughout the trial the populace had given unmistakable proof of its Tory and High Church proclivities. The issue was hailed with a tremendous outburst of enthusiasm, the sentence being far less rigorous than was expected. Bonfires and illuminations, and a crop of addresses magnifying the royal prerogative, testified to the popularity of Sacheverell's opinions. The queen did not hesitate to express her own sympathies. She at once preferred Sacheverell to the rich living of S. Andrew's, Holborn, and shortly afterwards to that of Salatin, in Shropshire. A disso-

lution of Parliament was succeeded by the return of a House in which Tories and High Churchmen largely predominated. The popularity of Toryism continued unimpaired until the end of the reign. The new Parliament paid its debt to the Church by a munificent provision for the purposes of worship. In the address to the queen it was stated that the want of churches had contributed to increase schism and irreligion. A grant of £350,000 was therefore voted to provide for the erection of fifty new churches, under the direction of Sir Christopher Wren, in London and its vicinity.

Provision
for new
churches.

The Latitudinarian impulse, however favourable to the cause of toleration, had been of little service to the spread of fixed religious principles. Heresy and infidelity were supported by many able writers, some of whom will receive further notice in the next chapter.

Literary ability, however, was by no means all on one side. Bull and Beveridge were among the bishops, the one the champion of the Church's Creeds, the other the author of valuable devotional works on "Public Prayer," "Frequent Prayer," and "Religion and Christian Life." Prideaux's "Connection of Sacred and Pagan History," Bingham's "Antiquities of the Christian Church," and Wall's "History of Infant Baptism" were equally important additions to Church literature. The genius of Swift was devoted to the cause of ecclesiastical Toryism, and the purer pages of Addison advocated that of Christian morality. This period leaves the Church at her highest point of influence. Her celebrity was such that Frederick I., by the advice of Jablouski his chaplain, caused the English Liturgy to be translated into German. It was even hoped that the Apostolical succession would be restored to the

Literary
produc-
tions of the
reign.

The
negotia-
tions with
the German
Protes-
tants.

CHAP.

XVII.

Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies by the agency of the Church of England, as a first step towards union. With this end in view, Dodwell wrote his "Parænesis to Foreigners" in 1704. Archbishop Sharp, Bishop Smalridge, Mr. R. Hales, and Dr. Ernest Grabe, an Anglicized Prussian, were the most active promoters of the negotiations. Archbishop Tenison regarded them with apathy. The conferences on this subject

A.D. 1713. were brought to a close by the death of Frederick.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Georgian Period.

A.D. 1714-1820.

Fatal effects of the change of dynasty—Degeneracy of bishops—Suppression of Convocation—Wake's negotiations with the Gallican Church—The "Bangorian Controversy"—The doctrine of the Trinity impugned—Spread of heresy among Dissenters—The "Salter's Hall Controversy"—The *Regium Donum*—The so-called "Deists"—Their chief writers—The opponents of the Deists—Sermons on the reasonableness of Christianity—Hatred of enthusiasm—The sects as stagnant as the Church—Prevalence of indifferentism—The Methodist movement—John Wesley—His talents and temperament—His piety attributable to Anglo-Catholic influences—The Oxford Methodists—The mission to Georgia—Moravian influences—George Whitefield—Sensational sermons—Open-air preaching—The Church opposed to Methodism—The Methodists sound Churchmen—Course of the Methodist movement—The Calvinistic Methodists own themselves seceders—Wesley's mock consecration—Wesley dies deprecating secession—But his followers split into sects—The Evangelical revival—Its character—Its strength is in the parochial clergy—Its institutions void of system—The Church not stimulated by the Evangelical movement—The bishops—The clergy—The churches.

THE accession of a foreign prince who had departed from Lutheranism "to qualify himself for the crown,"¹ was generally regarded as an ill omen for the Church. The Legitimist cause had gained strength during the years 1710-1714, and now found special favour among the High Church clergy. Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, implored Bolingbroke to proclaim King James III. at Charing Cross as Queen Anne's successor.²

Fatal
effects of
the change
of dynasty.

¹ Atterbury, English Advice to the Freholders of England, 1714.

² Atterbury engaged in a treasonable correspondence with the exiled house which brought on him a sentence of banishment in 1723.

CHAP.
XVIII.

Degene-
racy of
bishops.

A.D. 1745

The Jacobite rising of the following year doubtless had the sympathies of a large majority of the clergy. On the other hand, the Whigs and Dissenters hastened to belaud the immoral and uninteresting foreigner as "one of the honestest men and one of the wisest princes in the world," "the darling of heaven," "endued with true piety, fortitude, temperance, prudence, justice, etc."¹ Both parties rightly read the signs of the times. The new dynasty brought to the Dissenters relief, to the Romanists and nonjurors fresh disabilities, and to the Church a condition of paralysis or enforced inertia, which was at its worst at the time of the Methodist movement, and was not thrown off for more than a century. On the one hand, the "Schism Act" and "Occasional Conformity Act" were repealed (1718) and the Test and Corporation Acts modified. On the other hand, the Houses of Convocation were suppressed, and the clergy, thus deprived of all semblance of self-government, were subjected to episcopal politicians who unblushingly neglected their duties, and sometimes never entered their dioceses. Scholars, scientists, philosophers, and rhetoricians were still to be found on the episcopal bench. But attachment to the House of Hanover was usually the one essential for promotion. And this attachment of itself precluded regard for the Church's interests and sympathy with the parochial clergy. Charles Stuart's informant, Dr. Wagstaffe, probably did not misrepresent the condition of the Church, when he informed him that he "was not to judge of the English clergy by the bishops, who were not promoted for their piety and learning, but for writing pamphlets, being active at elections, and voting as the ministry

¹ See Abbey and Overton, *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. p. 98; Stanhope, *Hist.*, vol. i. p. 94.

directed them.”¹ In the middle of the century true “overseers” of the Church were rarely to be found, and the episcopal body rather deteriorated than otherwise during the period of the “Evangelical” revival. The idea of a bishopric being a prize, rather than a responsible post, largely obtained at the beginning of the present century.

CHAP.
XVIII.

The ministry of the new sovereign perceived that the strength of Anglicanism lay in Convocation. The representative body of the Church was therefore suppressed. The story of this monstrous invasion of constitutional rights is as follows:—Hoadly, already notorious as an Erastian, had been promoted by George I. to the bishopric of Bangor. In March, 1717, he published a sermon on the “Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ.” He argued from the text, S. John xviii. 36, that Christ had never intended to establish a visible kingdom, such as the Catholic Church, and he accordingly impugned all tests of orthodoxy and forms of ecclesiastical government. Such a betrayal of the Church’s cause naturally infuriated the suppressed High Church clergy. As an admirer has expressed it, Hoadly’s sermon “was in fact a proclamation of the unchristian character of the Church of which he himself was a bishop.”² The opinion of nine-tenths of the Anglican clergy was doubtless that expressed in the “Representation” sent by the Lower to the Upper House of Convocation. This charged Hoadly with undermining the religious constitution of England and endangering all established authority. It implored the prelates to “vindicate the honour of God and religion” by an outspoken condemnation of the sermon. Before the Upper House replied the ministry gave orders that

Suppression of
Convocation.

Nov. 23.
1717.

¹ Ewald, *Life of Prince Charles Stuart*, vol. i. p. 217. ² *Free Churches*, p. 292.

CHAP.
XVIII.

Convocation should be prorogued. A persistent refusal to renew the licence for its convention gave this prorogation the effect of an act of suppression. Its creditable denunciation of Hoadly was the last act of the eighteenth-century Church in council. Not till a hundred and thirty-seven years had lapsed was Convocation even allowed to debate. The impugned prelate, after holding the see of Bangor six years without once entering the diocese, was translated first to Hereford, then to Salisbury, and died as Bishop of Winchester in 1761.

Wake's negotiations with the Gallican Church.

It appears strange to find in so eminently Protestant a reign as that of George I. the last record of peaceful negotiations with the Roman Catholic body. Archbishop Wake, however, was a man of different calibre from the typical Georgian prelates; one who could sympathize with the Gallican body—the Church of Bossuet, Pascal, and Fénelon—in its struggle to gain an independent footing as a national Church. Wake had already distinguished himself by his defence of the Anglican position in a literary war with Bossuet. Letters passed in the year 1717 between the primate and Du Pin, head of the theological faculty at the Sorbonne, with a view to the union of the Anglican and Gallican bodies. The scheme would doubtless have had the good wishes of many an English Churchman, but at no time was there less hope of its succeeding. The deaths of Du Pin and De Gerardin put an end to the negotiations. In France papal absolutism gained the day. In England the vulgar prejudice against Roman Catholicism gained in intensity, and was humoured by severer disabling Acts. When in the year 1778 it was proposed to render these less rigorous, a storm of fury broke out in Scotland, spread to England, and culminated in the Gordon riots.

Hoadly's sermon was attacked and defended in the innumerable pamphlets of the "Bangorian Controversy."

CHAP.
XVIII.

The chief writers on the Church side were Bishop Sherlock and the celebrated nonjuror William Law. Five of the royal chaplains incurred dismissal for

The "Bangorian Controversy."

impugning the doctrines of the Erastian prelate. Controversies of more vital importance were soon agitating the public mind. The influence of the Latitudinarians under William has been already noticed. Their lukewarmness in Church matters restored this party to favour and importance on the accession of George I. It had been drifting meanwhile first to the tenets of the Arians and Unitarians, and then to that absolute negation of divine interposition which was called Deism. As far back as 1685 the spread of unsound views on the doctrine of the Trinity had evoked Bull's famous defence of the Nicene Creed. Chillingworth had gone perilously near Arianism, and Locke and Newton both inclined to this form of heresy. But the first notorious impugnors of the doctrine of our first Article were William Whiston and Dr. Samuel Clarke.¹ Dr. Clarke's "Scriptural Doctrine of the Trinity" was censured by the Lower House of Convocation in 1714. Its author's qualified recantation saved it from incurring the same fate in the Upper House. It has been styled the textbook of modern Arianism. It now secured "the great Dr. Clarke" a considerable reputation in the upper

The doctrine of the Trinity impugned.

¹ Clarke had been chaplain to Moore, Bishop of Norwich, and Boyle Lecturer two years consecutively. He had been promoted under Anne to a royal chaplaincy and the rectory of St. James's, Westminster, and had distinguished himself in a controversy with the elder Dodwell. Whiston had also been chaplain to Moore, who gave him the living of Lowestoft. He succeeded Newton as Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, but was subsequently expelled the university. His credulity in the matter of the Apostolical Constitutions was characteristic: "He believed in everything except the Trinity."

CHAP.
XVIII.

A.D. 1747.

A.D. 1719.

Spread of
heresy
among
Dissenters.

The
"Salter's
Hall Con-
troversy."

The
"Regium
Donum."

classes, and the favour of Caroline, the queen of George II. It was only characteristic of this unhappy era that, some years later, Clarke's Arian Prayer-book received the approval of a primate—Archbishop Herring. Dr. Clarke was answered by Dr. Wells, Bishop Gastrell, Mr. Nelson, and Dr. Waterland. The last named not only demolished Clarke, but left to posterity the clearest and most able exposition of the doctrine of the Nicene Creed that had ever been published. This did not prevent a fresh outbreak of controversy on the doctrine of the Trinity at the close of the century, when Dr. Priestly, a great natural philosopher, who had embraced Socinianism, was confuted by Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Horsley in the "seventeen letters."

Among the Dissenters these new forms of unbelief spread with fearful celerity. Dissenting synods at Exeter, and at Salter's Hall in London, had split on the question of rejecting our Church's first Article. The literary warfare which succeeded was known among Dissenters as the "Salter's Hall Controversy." Bradbury, a popular preacher, headed the orthodox party. A form of Socinianism appears to have been the type of heresy adopted by the impugners of the Article, who came for the most part from the sect of Presbyterians. Whole congregations not unfrequently became Socinian, and transferred to the new communion their chapels and endowments. In less than half a century "the doctrines of the great founders of Presbyterianism could scarcely be heard from any Presbyterian pulpit."¹ In connexion with this controversy may be noticed the *Regium Donum*, or bribe for political support, which the Presbyterians secured from Walpole in 1723, and received for more than a

¹ Stoughton, Religion in England, i. 117.

century and a quarter. Similar grants had been made by Charles II. and William III. It now took the form of a *douceur* to Edmund Calamy, on his dedicating a volume of Salter's Hall polemics to the King. It continued to increase throughout the century, and was £39,746 when it was abolished in 1863.

CHAP.
XVIII.

But the wave of heterodoxy, where not stemmed by the bulwark of Catholic principle, swept away far more than the doctrine of the Saviour's Divinity. The Latitudinarians proceeded to attack the credibility of the miracles and the possibility of a Divine revelation. It was plausibly urged that the New Testament was only Church literature such as Protestantism had repudiated. Christianity was denounced as unphilosophical or demoralizing, or as at best effete and unnecessary. Assailants of this kind were usually, though inaccurately, denominated "Deists." Already something akin to Deism had been advocated by Lord Herbert of Cherbury and Thomas Hobbes; and in 1696 Toland's "Christianity not mysterious" had been presented by the grand jury of Middlesex, and burnt by the hangman in Dublin. Shaftesbury had followed with his "Characteristics of Men and Manners," a more insidious publication, which sapped the foundations of Christianity while recommending its retention on utilitarian principles. About the same time Anthony Collins published the "Discourse of Free Thinking," a work which caused the greatest excitement. Swift, Berkeley, Bentley, Whiston, and Hoadly all entered the lists against Collins, who, far from being silenced, produced an elaborate attack on the evidence from Old Testament prophecy, entitled a "Discourse on the Grounds and Reasonableness of the Christian Religion." Woolston in his "Six Discourses on the Miracles"

The so-called
"Deists."

Their
chief
writers.

A.D. 1713.

A.D. 1724.

CHAP.
XVIII.

assumed the rôle of a moderator between an infidel—Collins—and an apostate—the Church of England. The literal interpretation of the miracles was here ridiculed in the coarsest terms, and a crazy system of mystical interpretation substituted. Woolston was the only Deist who suffered persecution. He was fined £100, imprisoned, and required to find securities in large sums. The securities were not forthcoming, and the Deist confessor lingered in prison till his death in 1731. Dr. Tindal may be regarded as the chief exponent of real Deism. In “Christianity as old as the Creation” he argues that natural conscience had practically anticipated Christianity. A revelation was thus unnecessary and was not even to be considered possible. The same ground was taken by Dr. Morgan in the “Moral Philosopher,” and by Thomas Chubb, in a number of tracts and essays written for the lower orders. Another important publication of the Deist school was Bolingbroke’s posthumous “Philosophical Works.” The “First Philosophy” sweeps away every part of Christianity but its moral teaching. It leaves “a God Omnipotent and all-perfect, but inconceivable. . . . No particular providence, no future state, no immaterial soul.”¹ In the next generation “Deism” took the form of sneering unscientific scepticism. Of this school the chief representatives are Hume, Gibbon, and Paine. Hume was too much of an unbeliever to be even a Deist, and indignantly disclaimed the title.

The
opponents
of the
Deists.

The answers to these writers came to a large extent from the episcopal bench, and the achievements of the eighteenth-century dignitaries in this regard to some extent counterbalance their *laches* in other departments of clerical work. The most popular publication of

¹ Cooke’s Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke, ii. 152.

this kind was probably Bishop Sherlock's "Trial of the Four Witnesses." The general credibility of the gospel history was also ably maintained by Lardner the Socinian. Able replies to Shaftesbury were written by Dr. Wotton and Dr. Balguy. Collins was well opposed by Dr. Chandler and Dr. Sykes; Woolston by Bishops Gibson, Smalbroke, and Zachary Pearce. Among the hundred and fifteen answers evoked by Tyndal, Dr. Conybeare's is conspicuous for ability, precision, and dignity. But the most important production was the immortal "Analogy" of Bishop Butler. This also was designed as an answer to Tindal's book, though it is far more extensive in its scope. High rank must also be given to Bishop Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses," a voluminous work of great learning and enormous range, and the more readable "Alciphron" of Bishop Berkeley, written in dialogistic form. Paley's "Evidences" and "Natural Theology" were the answer to the later generation of sceptics, and in point of merit almost rival the "Analogy." Bishop Watson wrote against the same school as Paley, and was acknowledged by Gibbon to be a worthy antagonist.

A.D. 1736.

A.D. 1794.

Though the Deists were beaten in argument, this controversy exercised directly and indirectly a pernicious influence on the religion of the century. The apologists found imitators in innumerable pulpits, and the "reasonableness" of the Christian religion became the favourite topic for preaching. Christianity was accused every Sunday in being excused. The stock of Augustine's planting was as little likely to flourish under such treatment as a tree which is being continually pulled up by the roots, nervously examined, and replaced. The "reasonableness" of religion is, after all,

Sermons on
the reason-
ableness of
Christian-
ity.

CHAP.
XVIII.

an incentive of little force in a scheme intended to include the unreasoning many. In theory—as an intellectual creed, as a proven moral system—Christianity held its own. But the appeal was ever to the head instead of the heart. Christianity was not exhibited as an influence on the emotions, nor as the root of spiritual affections. To regard it in this capacity was to be guilty of “enthusiasm.” The practical result was that those who did believe lived much as those who did not.

Hatred
of enthu-
siasm.

A.D. 1708.

A.D. 1686-
1761.

Emotional religion was perhaps somewhat discredited by the influx of the “Camisards,” or “French prophets,” who had flocked into England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, bringing with them a strange system of fanaticism, in which may be detected the origin of some of the vagaries of Methodism. Less open to the charge of enthusiasm was the teaching of the great nonjuror pietist William Law, whose “Serious Call,” perhaps, did as much for practical Christianity as all the writings of the apologists. Yet Law also appears to have been infected by the questionable systems of such mystics as Tauler and Jacob Behmen.

Enthusiasm, however, was not the predominant vice of those who held similar political and ecclesiastical views to Law. Here, as elsewhere, the tendency was to make religion subservient to political principle. After the deaths of Bull, Beveridge, Ken, and Nelson, High Churchmanship rapidly degenerated into ecclesiastical Toryism,¹ and the religious life of the party was infected by the general blight of apathy and indifference.

The sects as

The Nonconformist sects which had contributed so

¹ English Church in the Eighteenth Century, i. 136.

largely to the ranks of infidelity were, as might be expected, even more devoid of vitality and earnestness than the Church. In 1740, Mosheim writes, "those who are best acquainted with the English nation tell us that the Dissenting interest declines from day to day." He regards this as the effect of the lenity and moderation practised by the rulers of the Church. It would appear, rather, that the distinctive doctrines of the Church were so toned down by the Georgian prelates that there was not much left to dissent from. Elaborate schemes for levelling down to the plane of Nonconformity were broached from time to time with the approval of bishops. The ministries, however, mindful of the effect of the "Church in danger" cry in 1710, declined to meddle in such matters. The question of "comprehension" was happily shelved.

CHAP.
XVIII.
stagnant as
the Church.

The limits of this work preclude a detailed account of a period of religious indifferentism to which, despite its controversial productions, the earnest Anglican reverts with shame and sorrow. It is easy to conceive how the State policy which silenced the Church's representative body, and gradually deprived her of a working episcopate, in time extended its paralyzing influences throughout priesthood and laity. Under the frown of ministries and bishops the fervent Churchmanship of the preceding period withered and passed away. We find it surviving in old-fashioned Tory households, or in the seclusion of country parsonages, in good Bishop Wilson's insular and unremunerative see, or in a handful of obscure guilds. If we search for it in high places, in important livings, in cathedral towns, in spheres which are supposed to be filled by the worthier sons of the Church, we search in vain. The "Establishment" had become the very upas tree of

Prevalence
of indiffer-
entism.

CHAP.

XVIII.

The
Methodist
movement.

Anglicanism. Only in the departments of controversy and party politics was the influence of the Church felt.

It is in view of this condition of Christianity that the Methodist movement must be judged to be rightly understood. The Methodist sects at the present day are religious bodies distinctly severed from the Church, albeit not regarding her with the rancour of the political Dissenter. Their great founder, on the contrary, lived and died a Churchman. Under protest, indeed, and to save his excellent system from perishing beneath the paralyzing influences of the State Church connexion, he committed himself to acts of a distinctly schismatic character. Persecuted and misunderstood, he allowed certain of his followers to become sectarians until the authorities should allow them to be Churchmen. The Church awoke from her lassitude to find that the rupture was irreparable. John Wesley was born at Epworth Rectory in 1703. His parents were loyal Anglicans, and opposed to the Low Church dynasty. To remarkable eloquence and extraordinary energy the Reformer joined a capacity for administration and organization that has perhaps never been equalled. These great gifts were marred by masterfulness, impulsiveness, and a tendency to puerile superstition, not uncommon among good men of his day. He believed in dreams, directed his movements by the first text in an opened Bible, and discovered miraculous interpositions where more sober Christians saw only the orderly system of Providence. Always a devout person, each new phase of his religious life brought him to regard the period preceding as one in which he knew not God. As in the cases of Dr. Johnson and Bishop Wilson, the seed sown in a pious home was stimulated by William Law's "Serious Call" and "Christian

John
Wesley.His talents
and tem-
perament.

Perfection." From equally unexceptionable sources came the system which secured for the Wesleys and their *coterie* at Oxford the name of Methodists. Religious guilds of more or less austere character had been set on foot in London and other large towns by Horneck, Beveridge, and others about the time of the Revolution. The "Holy" or "Methodist" Club was a guild whose members practised a life of great self-denial, and were frequent communicants—a feature so strange in those days as to provoke the additional sobriquet, "Sacramentarians." Wesley was ordained in 1725. His first independent enterprise was a missionary expedition to Georgia to convert the Indians. Despite his self-denial and devotion, this mission was a failure, and he contrived to make enemies with the colonists by acts of singular indiscretion. This enterprise is notable as bringing Wesley in contact with some Moravian missionaries, whose peculiar opinions were henceforth to be a powerful agency in his ministerial work. The most striking features in their scheme of theology were the doctrines of "instantaneous conversion" and an accompanying "assurance" of salvation. On Wesley's return to England he made the acquaintance of Peter Böhler, a Moravian minister, who riveted the impression made by the missionaries. He conceived himself to be "converted" in May, 1738.

Meanwhile a somewhat similar experience had befallen another Oxford Methodist, George Whitefield. Far inferior to Wesley in birth, intellect, and culture, Whitefield was possessed of an oratorical talent which afterwards made him the most persuasive preacher England has ever produced. His taste was execrable and his mind narrow, but his sincerity and zeal are undeniable. His pious labours in Gloucester gaol had induced

CHAP.
XVIII.

His piety attributable to Anglo-Catholic influences.

The Oxford Methodists.

The mission to Georgia.

Moravian influences.

George Whitefield.

CHAP.
XVIII.Sensa-
tional
sermons.Open-air
preaching.

Bishop Benson to ordain him at the early age of twenty-one. Whitefield learnt from the French refugees in London an emotional religion akin to that of the Moravians. But he added what Wesley's superior intellect always spurned—those Calvinistic dogmas which open the gates of mercy only to a predestined few. The two great "Methodists" soon provoked attention and antagonism by an enthusiastic style of preaching markedly contrasting with that in vogue. Some disgraceful disturbances ensued, resulting in their exclusion from the churches of their brother clergy. The expedient of open-air preaching was now resorted to. A mission was begun at Kingswood, near Bristol, which drew enormous congregations. This was the precursor of an evangelizing scheme carried out in every part of these islands, and extended to America. It was a work unlike anything since the mission of the Friars in the thirteenth century. Thousands whom the emasculated State Church system had neglected or failed to influence were now affected by the zeal of the Methodists, and professed to have realized the comfort of the Gospel.

The Church
opposed to
Method-
ism.

The sincerity of this profession is undeniable in many, perhaps in the majority of cases. The flaws in the emotional system are, however, sufficiently obvious, and our own experience of American revivalism may lead us to credit the charge that self-deception largely predominated. It is plain also that the convulsions which Wesley attributed to supernatural agency were merely marks of that infectious hysteria which had so often appeared in the Middle Ages in connexion with sensational preaching. But however imperfect the system, taunts came ill from those who had neglected to teach the lower orders a better way.

"It was surely better that the heathens of Kingswood should be thus evangelized than not be evangelized at all." The Church dignitaries, however, thought otherwise. The movement was regarded throughout with indifference or ill-will. Their conduct in this matter appears the more shameful when we reflect that the Methodists were staunch Churchmen, wholly averse to schism. The Wesleys were far more devoted to the Anglican system than the majority of the bench, and as free from heterodox opinion. The worst charge against the Methodist preachers was that their deep faith in Divine Providence led them to dogmatize unnecessarily on the operations of the Holy Spirit. Their doctrines of "conversion" and "assurance" confined within a Procrustean frame—narrow as that of ultra-Romanism—those gracious influences which the Saviour Himself depicted as free as the winds of heaven.¹ But numbers of Catholics have held these doctrines, and overestimated them as much as the Methodists did. A schismatic John Wesley was not. None better appreciated the true spirit of Puritan Dissent. "We are not seceders," he writes, "nor do we bear any resemblance to them. The seceders laid the foundation of their work in judging and condemning others. We . . . in judging and condemning ourselves. They begin everywhere by showing how fallen the Church and ministers are; we . . . with showing our hearers how fallen they are themselves."

The insubordinate and anti-sacramental tendencies of the Moravians soon repelled both Wesley and Whitefield (1740). In the following year the Cal-

CHAP
XVIII.

The Methodists sound Churchmen.

Course of the Methodist movement.

¹ In later years Wesley qualified these shibboleths. "When, fifty years ago," he writes, "my brother Charles and I told the good people of England that unless they knew their sins were forgiven they were under the curse of God, I marvel they did not stone us. The Methodists, I hope, know better now."

CHAP.
XVIII.

A.D. 1744.

The Calvinistic
Methodists
own them-
selves
seceders.

vinism of Whitefield was found to necessitate a rupture between the two friends. A reconciliation took place nine years later, but Methodism continued to flow in two distinct channels—the Arminian and the Calvinistic; the one directed by the brothers Wesley, the other by Whitefield and the Countess of Huntingdon. During Wesley's lifetime one section at least of the Methodists was kept within the bounds of system and discipline. The converts of the different regions were grouped in "societies" or "circles." These were subdivided by means of "classes" and "bands." All this machinery was still professedly subsidiary to the Church. The first Wesleyan Conference proclaimed that the peculiar tenets of Methodism were these; viz. that justifying faith is a conviction of personal salvation; that no person can be justified and not know it; that inward conviction is the proof of faith. This Conference also decided that bishops and Church canons were to be obeyed as far as possible. But the bishops persistently refused their sympathy. The clergy were encouraged to close their churches against Methodist missionaries in Holy Orders. Those not ordained sought ordination in vain. We cannot wonder that in 1750 the question of secession from the Church was mooted. In 1755 the Conference took no higher ground than that of *expediency*, in prohibiting unordained preachers from administering the Holy Communion. In 1760 the society at Norwich infringed this regulation. In the year 1781 some litigation with respect to the legal status of Lady Huntingdon's chapels compelled the Calvinistic Methodists to register them as Dissenting places of worship. They reluctantly called themselves "seceders." It was not long before they cheerfully owned themselves Dissenters.

The pretext for the Wesleyan secession was afforded by Wesley's conduct in the matter of the American consecrations. Even here, if we condemn Wesley's precipitation, the chief blame must fall on the national prelates. For upwards of a century the colonists in America had been petitioning the mother country to send out bishops, to superintend the Transatlantic offshoot of our Church. It seems scarcely credible that this demand was considered preposterous—that its supporters were assailed by statesmen, and even by prelates with denunciation and rebuke. Episcopacy might be tolerated, but that a distinctively Catholic accessory should be esteemed and extended was intolerable to the Georgian Latitudinarians. John Wesley saw that, whatever the issue of this struggle,¹ it would be hopeless to ask that Methodist bishops should be consecrated or Methodist pastors ordained. Yet must his American societies have that machinery for supervision which has never been wanting in any branch of the Catholic Church. He chose what he considered the less of two evils, and, to the horror of numerous friends and followers, himself appointed two English clergymen as “superintendents,” and two laymen as “presbyters,” by laying on of hands. It was a precedent which boded ill for the future of Methodism. The way was paved for secession and its consequence, sectarian dissidence. Both followed directly the master mind of Methodism ceased to exercise control. “In God's name, stop there. Be Church of England men still. Do not cast away the peculiar

CHAP.
XVIII.

Wesley's
mock con-
secration.

A.D. 1784.

Wesley
dies depre-
cating se-
cession.

¹ It is remarkable that the battle was practically won before the close of the year which witnessed Wesley's mock consecration. Dr. Seabury was consecrated as Bishop of Connecticut by the Primus of Scotland in November, 1784. In 1787 all difficulties were overcome in England, and two more bishops were consecrated by Archbishop Moore.

CHAP.
XVIII.

But his
followers
split into
sects.

The
Evange-
lical
revival.
A.D. 1775-
1820.

Its cha-
racter.

glory which God hath put upon you." Such was his final charge on the subject to his preachers. But he spoke in vain. Four years after his death the "Plan of Pacification" gave the preachers authority to administer the Lord's Supper (1795). Henceforth the Church had to regard the "people called Methodists" not as a loyal and persecuted ecclesiastical guild, but as an antagonistic and powerful congeries of sects.¹

A happier consequence of the Methodist movement, was the rise of the "Evangelical" school within the Church. Its members were pietists of the Whitefield type. They held a lower view of the Church than Wesley, and were mostly Calvinists. It was not always plain why they belonged to the Church rather than to the Methodist sects. They ignored the objective side of religion altogether, were weak on the point of baptismal regeneration, cared nothing for the decencies of worship, and transferred to the pulpit the dignity of the altar. They divided their hearers into two classes, "believers" and "unbelievers," and holding that a sudden conversion was essential to salvation, preached to effect it. Luther's doctrine of imputed righteousness was the key-note of all their sermons, which were of fearful length, and varied mainly in the amount of Calvinism superadded. They inveighed fiercely, not only against

¹ The following details are taken from Mr. Curteis's *Dissent in its Relation to the Church*:—"Two years later, a large secession took place (1797), under a minister named Kilham, on the question of admitting lay representatives to the annual Conference; and the *Methodist New Connexion* was formed. In 1810 the question of open-air preaching and of 'revivals' caused another schism, and the *Primitive Methodists* broke away from the parent body. In 1815 the *Bible Christians* seceded. In 1835 a quarrel broke out on the proposal to establish a Theological College, and an eminent minister, Dr. Warren, . . . was expelled." His supporters founded the *Wesleyan Methodist Association*. In connexion with the same cause the *Wesleyan Methodist Reformers* sprang into life in 1849. Other branches living and dead may be mentioned—all boasting the High Churchman Wesley as their parent stem.

the stage (at that time hopelessly degraded), but against many innocent diversions. From these the converted were debarred. With this exception, they had no "guidance" for the soul, believing that sufficient was to be found in St. Paul's Epistles. They dared to stigmatize practical exhortations as "not the Gospel."

Even this bald, mutilated form of theology was a vast improvement on the lifeless system hitherto prevalent. Its professors were pious, hard-working parish priests, strict, to the verge of prudery, in their manner of life, yet enthusiastic and sympathetic on the one point of religion. Under the influence of the Methodist and Evangelical movements, the Church here and there recovered vitality. There was a reaction against profligacy and scepticism. Many philanthropic schemes were successfully carried out. But it was ever the inspiration of detached units, not of the mass. For corporate action the Evangelical system offered no scope. It was a purely subjective religion, one based on feelings, to the exclusion of creeds and means of grace. Its view of the Christian gathering was fundamentally at variance with the congregational system of our Prayer-book, and it attached no value to accessories of worship. Naturally the services continued as slovenly, and the fabrics as uncared for, as during the period of religious apathy.

For the Evangelical as for the Methodist movement the Church was indebted to the priesthood. The episcopate remained averse to "enthusiasm." Bishop Porteus and Dean Milner were the only Evangelicals who got high preferment in the eighteenth century. The fathers of the Evangelical school were Fletcher of Madeley, Venn of Huddersfield, Toplady of Broadhembury, Berridge of Everton, Hervey of Wellyn,

Its strength is in the parochial clergy.

CHAP.
XVIII.

Romaine of London, Newton of Olney, and Rowland Hill, who eventually established a religion of his own at Surrey Chapel. Later came Cecil, Conyers, Scott, Venn of Clapham, and Simeon. The most eminent Evangelicals among the laity were William Wilberforce, Lord Dartmouth, Lord Teignmouth, the two Thorntons, and Hannah More.

Its institutions void of system.
A.D. 1781.

Perhaps the most valuable result of the Evangelical revival was the institution of Sunday schools. They were first introduced at Gloucester by Robert Raikes, a printer, and Mr. Stock, a clergyman. They were soon extended in every direction. The distinctive teaching of the Church was not inculcated in these earlier Sunday schools. A similar disregard for system is noticeable in the four societies which owe their birth to the Evangelicals—the Church Missionary Society, the Religious Tract Society, the Bible Society, and the British and Foreign School Society.

The Church not stimulated by the Evangelical movement.

It is perhaps a proof of the capacity of the Anglican system to satisfy minds of every type, that the leading Evangelicals did not largely lapse to Dissent,¹ nor often canvass for alterations in the Prayer-book. It is certainly impossible to believe that these reformers owed much to the Church. There was truth in the apophthegm of a famous Dissenting preacher who described them as would-be Dissenters who had lost their way. The Church system, in fact, became more and more vitiated throughout the reign of George III. The literary bishops gave place to hangers-on of the aristocracy. Younger sons and connexions of peers, or private tutors in the families of

¹ Their converts only too often accepted Antinomian schemes akin to those of the earlier Puritans: Scott, who succeeded the celebrated Newton at Olney, found the parish brimful of Antinomians and Dissenters. The later phase of the Evangelical movement was especially conducive to dissent.

The
bishops.

noblemen and statesmen, filled nineteen out of twenty-six bishoprics in the year 1815. The episcopal revenues were at this time enormous, yet the bishops did not blush to provide for their own by bestowal of canonries, rectories, etc. When not engaged in affairs of state, they commonly spent all their hours in lettered ease. Such episcopal duties as confirmation, and examining for orders and conferring orders, were neglected, or performed in a slovenly, perfunctory fashion. The clergy were also often non-resident, but with more excuse. The clerical status had altered, but nothing had been done to provide residences fit for persons who now ranked as gentlemen. In numberless parishes a ruinous cottage betokened the site of the ancient parsonage, and there was no means of securing a better accommodation. Livings were therefore amalgamated. Not unfrequently two or more churches were served on Sunday from the nearest town,¹ and this was all the parishes saw of their incumbent. Fifteen churches in the Norwich diocese were served by three brothers as recently as 1837. "Hannah More speaks of thirteen contiguous parishes without even a resident curate. A clergyman of the diocese of Norwich wrote: 'When first I came here in 1837, out of twenty-eight parishes, five churches only were open for divine service twice on the Lord's Day.'"² The state of the fabrics defies description. Church restoration was not thought of. It was rarely that new churches were built to meet the wants of the increasing population.³

The
churches.

¹ This appears to have been almost invariably the case with the parishes round the university towns. There are few country parsonages within seven miles of Cambridge that are more than forty years old.

² See Hore's *Eighteen Centuries of the Church of England*, p. 545 and seq.

³ Bishop Porteus, an Evangelical, held the see of London from 1787 to 1808. During that time not one church was built in London. Bishop Blomfield during the years 1828-1856 consecrated nearly two hundred.

CHAP.
XVIII.

The Holy Communion was administered yearly to a few aged persons. The young generation grew up utterly ignorant of Church doctrine. Mr. Gladstone in 1874 thus describes the condition of our English churches "fifty and forty years ago," *i.e.* after a full half century of the Evangelical system: "The actual state of things as to worship was bad beyond all parallel known to me in experience or reading. Taking together the expulsion of the poor and labouring classes (especially from the town churches), the mutilation and blockages of the fabrics, the baldness of the service, the elaborate horrors of the so-called music . . . and, above all, the coldness and indifference of the lounging and sleeping congregation, our services were probably without a parallel in the world for their debasement; and as they would have shocked a Brahmin or a Buddhist, so they hardly could have been endured in this country had not the faculty of taste and the perception of the seemly or unseemly been as dead as the spirit of devotion."¹

¹ "Ritual and Ritualism," *Contemporary Review*, October, 1874.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Church of the Present Day.

A.D. 1820-1881.

Evangelical zeal fused with the Church's system—The Tractarians—The revival begins at Oxford—And spreads throughout the country—Resentment of the dominant factions—The "Surplice Riot"—Secessions to Rome—Encouraged by the Gorham Judgment—Yet the Latitudinarians lose ground—And the Evangelicals have to go with the tide of Anglicanism—Convocation allowed to deliberate—The colonial episcopate extended—New English bishoprics—Sunday schools subsidiary to the Church's system—Church seats made free—Other beneficial results—League of unbelievers and political Dissenters.—Anomalies in the State connexion—Spoliation and encroachments—Prospect of disestablishment—Persecution in matters of ritual—The Privy Council Committee made Supreme Court of Appeal—This arrangement at variance with the Reformation settlement—Rise of the "Ritualists"—The Puritans harass ritualistic clergymen in the new court—Questionable decisions—The "Public Worship Regulation Act"—Three aggrieved parishioners—The new tribunal not acknowledged—Present results of the contest—Decisions of the Privy Council Committee.

THE period of ecclesiastical stagnation coincides approximately with the era of the four Georges. The teaching of such men as Cecil and Simeon had doubtless done much to promote "seriousness," and to enlist the sympathies of earnest men in the cause of philanthropy. But the Evangelical system was at best an exaggeration of one part of the Catholic scheme. One-sided and narrow, it was capable of producing a limited number of ascetics and devotees, but utterly unable to leaven society. Evangelical zeal had to be diverted into

Evangelical zeal fused with the Church's system.

CHAP.
XIX.The
Tracta-
rians.

other channels ere the Church could be roused from her lethargy. This diversion was effected by the "Tractarian" movement, a revival which has been well described as "not antagonistic but supplemental" to its precursor, "holding quite as strongly the necessity of conversion, justification by faith, and the supremacy of the Scriptures; but also bringing into prominence those doctrines which the Evangelicals had undervalued—the doctrine of the sacraments, of faith showing itself by works, of Church authority, and the Apostolical succession."¹ The first sign of this great

A.D. 1827.

The revival
begins at
Oxford.

revival was the publication of Keble's "Christian Year." The extraordinary influence of this book—now probably the most widely read of all devotional works—was fitly augured by the rage it excited in Low Church and Latitudinarian circles. It was not long before the "Christian Year" was publicly burnt at Oxford. Six years later came Keble's celebrated

A.D. 1833.

sermon on "National Apostacy," immediately followed by the first meeting of the Oxford "Tractarians." The two special objects which these great reformers set before them were the maintenance and assertion of Catholic doctrine, especially the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, and the preservation of the Prayer-book in its integrity. The leading names were Keble, Newman, Percival, William Palmer, Isaac Williams, Hurrell Froude, and (after 1836) Dr. Pusey. The "Tracts for the Times" made their first appearance in 1833. The series was closed in 1841, with Newman's celebrated No. 90. Meanwhile the sister university had caught the inspiration, and given birth to the Camden Society. A strange vitality was soon

A.D. 1838.

And
spreads

¹ Eighteen Centuries of the Church of England, p. 551. To this excellent work we are indebted for several details in this Chapter.

discernible in the long-neglected parishes. The doctrinal and practical teaching of the Prayer-book was again taught from the pulpit; the sacraments were "rightly and duly administered;" services were celebrated on saint's days, and even daily; new churches rose to meet the requirements of the increasing town population; parsonages were built in the country parishes; the ancient fabrics were purged, restored, and beautified; music was again made the handmaid of devotion; every accessory of worship was once more instinct with life and meaning. Above all, "to the poor the Gospel was preached," and no longer in the stereotype of Evangelicism. Every year Anglicanism became a stronger religious force, winning over Evangelicals and Dissenters, opening wide the purses of the rich, hallowing the daily toil of the busy, cheering the life of the suffering and indigent. The Low Church system was manifestly doomed. But it did not die without a struggle. It is not pleasant to record that the restoration of life to the dry bones of the Establishment was resented not only by Dissenters and indifferentists, but also by many Evangelicals. If to the former it was a defiance, to the latter it was a reproach. Warm controversies and disgraceful agitations ensued. A striking and instructive instance of senseless Puritanical furore was the (now forgotten) "Surplice Riot."¹ For a time the issue was doubtful.

CHAP.
XIX.

throughout
the
country.

Resentment of the
dominant
factions.

The
"Surplice
Riot."
A.D 1859.

¹ The happiest omen for the persecuted Anglicanism of the present day is to be found in the complacent and almost universal acceptance now of the ritual assailed forty years ago. Mr. Gladstone records the instructive case of a devoted clergyman who was persecuted out of his benefice "for the offence of having preached the morning sermon in the surplice, read the Prayer for the Church Militant, and opened his church for divine service, not daily, but on all festivals." He wisely remarks that the inference to be drawn from this change of feeling is "not an inference of self-laudation . . . but an inference in behalf of a little self-mistrust." Other and equally important lessons are to be learnt from the

CHAP.
XIX.

Secessions
to Rome.

En-
couraged
by the
Gorham
judgment.

A.D. 1865.

Yet the
Latitudi-
narianism
lose
ground.

The Church dignitaries long treated the Anglican, as they had treated the Methodist movement, with indifference, suspicion, or open hostility. Not until the second order of clergy had won the attention of a large section of the upper classes did the bishops find a good word for it. Meanwhile Newman had been harassed out of the Anglican fold. In March, 1850, the Privy Council Committee made its appearance as a theological faculty, and the country was startled by the Gorham Judgment. The true value of such sentences was not at that time appreciated. A section of the Oxford party argued that the Church was hopelessly committed to Erastianism. The secession of Manning, Dodsworth, the two Wilberforces, and Allies followed. These disasters gave a plausible appearance to the "No Popery" cry of the opponent faction, although almost all the seceders had begun life as Evangelicals. The sanction given to denial of baptismal grace was followed by the exculpation of the contributors to "Essays and Reviews," and the reinstatement of Bishop Colenso. In both cases judgments of bishops and Convocations, and the opinions of the clerical body at large, were overridden or disregarded.

It was expected that these triumphs of Erastianism would sap the very foundations of Anglicanism. Really they have rather helped the Church's cause by rousing men's minds to the meaning and value of Catholic dogma. It is recognized that the Church's formularies are only impugned because not speaking with Act of Parliament precision, and that (out of law courts) the interpretation which is at variance with common sense is also dishonest. This silent influence

reproduction in modern Congregational chapels of Gothic architecture, stained windows, organs, and surpliced choirs, if we bear in mind that the fathers of the sect discovered in such accessories of worship a pretext for leaving the Church.

of public opinion and their own inherent lack of proselytizing zeal has prevented the Latitudinarian doctrinaires from doing appreciable mischief within the Church's pales. If the Broad Church party was powerless to arrest the Anglican revival, much more so was the Evangelical. One by one the practices and the doctrines formerly stigmatized as "Puseyite" have been accepted by the clerical disciples of Simeon, sometimes spontaneously, sometimes at the instance of their congregations. It is hard to say where we should now find an Evangelical service of the old type. In view of fundamental principles, the Anglican, the Evangelical, and the Broad-Churchman must always remain slightly dissevered as types of three distinct casts of mind. But each now wisely recognizes that the other has his sphere of work, and that the Church is wide enough for all. In so speaking we of course except the few unhappy bigots—Puritans of the seventeenth-century type rather than Evangelicals—who have joined with the Church's foes to persecute what they call "Ritualism."

CHAP.

XIX.

And the Evangelicals have to go with the tide of Anglicanism.

Our readers must be contented with a very terse and jejune summary of the great results which attended the revival of Anglicanism. First we notice the reinstatement of Convocation as the Church's deliberative body. Much opposition was encountered from prelates as well as lay statesmen ere Convocation was allowed to meet according to ancient usage. Step by step it has since won its way to a status which bodes well for the future. It has already acted in the matters of the new Lectionary and the shortened services. Reorganized so as to ensure a fair representation of the parochial clergy, it will doubtless one day be summoned to act as the Church's Parliament. The representative principle will, we hope,

Convocation allowed to deliberate. A.D. 1851.

A.D. 1851-1854.

CH.

XIX.

The
colonial
episcopate
extended.
New
English
bishoprics.

Sunday
schools
subsidiary
to the
Church's
system.

Church
seats
made free.

Other
beneficial
results.

then be further developed in the form of true synods, limiting episcopal autocracy in the dioceses, in accordance with the intentions of the sixteenth-century reformers. The extension of the colonial episcopate is another valuable result. Prior to 1825 there were only five colonial bishoprics: they now number sixty-one. Six additions to the home bishoprics have been sanctioned quite recently—S. Alban's, Truro, Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, and Wakefield. Many more ought, of course, to be made, but the Church is hampered in this matter by her connexion with the State. The institution of the annual Church Congress has proved a happy expedient for bringing men of all parties together with a view to temperate discussion. Every year its sessions excite a deeper interest. Our Sunday school organization, though not originating with the Tractarian movement, like every other department of Church work, received from it a mighty impulse, affecting the quality of the teaching as well as the quantity of the scholars. In former days every strange type of Nonconformist doctrine struck root in the intellects of the lower classes as on virgin soil. The Anglicans have counteracted this popular ignorance as much by the substitution of Church doctrine for vague generalization in the Sunday school, as by the throwing open of churches to rich and poor alike. Nowhere have they laboured more successfully than among the working classes of our towns. For the recovery of the lower-middle class, which formerly hovered between a very unpractical Evangelicism and Dissent, Canon Woodard's magnificent scholastic scheme is in operation. Guilds, sisterhoods, colleges, choral associations, and numberless other institutions in connection with

religion, philanthropy, and culture, have sown themselves in every part of the land. The money spent on church building and restoration alone amounted for a considerable period to nearly £1,000,000 a year.

CHAP.
XIX.

We turn now to the less sunny side of the Church's fortunes. If her influence has seldom been so deeply felt, hardly ever has it been so bitterly opposed as in this generation. The Deism of the eighteenth century finds its counterpart now, outside the Church, in a degrading materialism, advocated by men of the highest intellectual calibre. The pious Nonconformist, the pretext for whose Dissent was often the indolence or the incapacity of the incumbent, has given place to the "political Dissenter," linked in unholy alliance with those who repudiate Christianity altogether. The object of their attack is the time-honoured alliance of Church and State. That this alliance presents in many ways an anomalous aspect in view of modern constitutional changes is plain enough. The grievance however, is not the non-Churchman's, but the Churchman's. The admission of Dissenters, Romanists, Jews, Deists, etc., to full rights of citizenship has been ceded.¹ But no proviso was added protecting the Church's interests. The Prime Minister now has the appointment of our bishops and deans. He may be a Dissenter, and need not be a Christian. The House of Commons, again, now represents Ireland and Scotland as well as England. It must contain a quantity, and often a majority, of men alien to our national communion. Yet it is to the Commons the Church must apply before she can even increase the number of her bishops. Anomalies of this kind affect

League of
unbe-
lievers and
political
Dissenters.

Anomalies
in the State
connexion.

¹ The disabilities of Dissenters were removed in 1828, those of Romanists in 1829, those of Jews in 1858.

CHAP.
XIX.

all the mutual relations of Church and State. The instance most familiar, perhaps, to the country clergy is the continued interference of Dissenters at meetings for election of churchwardens, while claiming absolute exemption from all charges for the maintenance of the Church's fabrics or services.

Spoliation
and en-
croach-
ment.

By the aid of fraudulent statistics,¹ however, the sects have represented themselves as all but a majority, as downtrodden by reason of their social status, and as groaning under the hardship of exclusion from "State endowments." In the Commons, as now constituted, this form of misrepresentation will of necessity often find favour. Admission to such Church benefices as lay fellowships at the universities was ceded in 1871, and a sweeping diversion of those intended for men in orders is impending. The sanction of all kinds of "Christian" ministration in the churchyard (time out of mind the parson's freehold) was secured by the Burial Laws Amendment Act of 1880. Disestablishment and disendowment may at this rate soon be brought within range of vision. The Irish Church has already experienced this fate. Neither the pretext nor the result can be at all similar in this country, but it is an issue for which faithful Anglicans will do well to prepare. That it would for a time terribly impair the religious life of England, especially that of country districts, is certain. On the other hand, it would probably free the Church from "perils among false brethren,"

Prospect of
disestab-
lishment.

¹ The disgraceful frauds by which the religious census of 1851 was made to produce a result of forty-eight non-Anglicans per cent. have been sufficiently exposed. Churchmen have since repeatedly appealed for a genuine religious census, but the Dissenters have thought fit to decline the challenge. It is computed in Ravensheim's Denomination Statistics that "the proportion of Dissenters of all kinds, Jews, Roman Catholics, and Secularists, amounts to twenty-two per cent. of the population of England and Wales." The figure is raised to about twenty-seven, if we judge only by army, school, and workhouse returns.

give her an episcopate more at one with the parochial clergy, ensure her the blessing of self-government, and abolish numerous anomalies which now impair her vitality and cripple her powers of action.

CHAP.
XIX.

Probably nothing has so much tended to depreciate the value of the State connexion as the episode of the Ritual prosecutions, with a brief account of which we close this history of our Church's fortunes. The subject involves a fuller account of the tribunal alluded to in connexion with the Gorham Judgment. In 1832 the old Court of Delegates was abolished. It was intended to leave ecclesiastical causes in the hands of the whole Privy Council, as including lords spiritual as well as temporal. But an Act of 1833, bearing on the readjustment of admiralty and colonial appeals, was, by a draughtsman's blunder, made to include ecclesiastical as well as other causes. These were thus accidentally transferred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, a quorum of laymen, all of whom but two might be Dissenters. The scandal was met by some provision for the presence of bishops at the hearing of cases, and this presence was "unduly embellished with the name of assessorship."¹ The constitution of the court provoked much attention at the time of the Gorham case. It was denounced by many statesmen, and the present Prime Minister regarded it as "an injurious and even dangerous departure from the Reformation settlement."² But none foresaw the full extent of the peril. Only four cases of doctrine or discipline had been brought before the Court of Delegates in the period 1690-1832, though that period comprised a century full of heterodoxy and clerical malpractice. It

Persecution in matters of ritual.

The Privy Council Committee made a Supreme Court of Appeal.

This arrangement at variance with the Reformation settlement.

¹ Gladstone, *The Royal Supremacy*, 1850.

² See *ibid.*, Preface to third edition, 1877.

CHAP.
XIX.

Rise of the
"Ritual-
ists."

The
Puritans
harass
Ritualistic
clergymen
in the new
court.

might well have been expected that the offices of the new court would be seldom required. The operation of the new machinery was, however, only too truly augured by the Gorham Judgment. Meanwhile Tractarianism was developing what is vulgarly called "Ritualism." Direct appeal to the soul was seconded by an elaborate system of accessories, affecting the religious instincts through the medium of the senses. The influence of such a system will necessarily depend largely on the physical and mental organization of the individual worshipper, and on the degree of culture attained or attainable. Its limits must ever be to a large degree a question first of discretion, then of good taste. The "Ritualists" proceeded cautiously, training men's minds to the significance of the objective side of worship, especially in the Eucharist service. Usually no new ritual was introduced till it commended itself to a majority of the communicants. The result was that their churches were attended by crowds of earnest and reverent worshippers. The factious Puritanism which had inspired the "Surplice Riots" soon vented its spleen on the "Ritualistic" congregations, and the anomalous condition of the ecclesiastical tribunal offered a good opportunity for harassing litigation. Once only was the true point at issue, the real Presence in the Sacrament, directly attacked. The verdict given grudgingly acquitted the very highest form of sacramental teaching. It might reasonably be urged that, if a doctrine is unimpeachable, its embodiment in the form of ritual must be left to the discretion of the minister and congregation. The Puritans, however, sunk the main issue and wreaked their resentment on external minutiae. Technical knowledge on such points was hardly to be expected in the modern High

Court of Appeal, and the subject had not at that time been fully investigated. Several decisions were gained adverse to the Ritualists, but adverse also to the opinions of high legal authorities,¹ which opinions have received substantial confirmation from the subsequent researches of antiquarians and experts. Hence a fresh cause of dissatisfaction. It was felt that the court was not only illegitimate by origin, but was also unable to give the points at issue full and impartial consideration.²

CHAP.
XIX.
Question-
able
decisions.

The climax came in 1874. The Puritans, by the aid of certain of the episcopate, secured a "Public Worship Regulation Act," transferring the work of the Privy Council Committee to a lay judge, who was also to combine the functions of the Dean of Arches and the Auditor of the Chancery Court of York. The bill was passed in defiance of Convocation, and fairly crowned the injustices of the past forty years. The Premier ingenuously confessed that it was an Act for "putting down Ritualism," meaning excess of ritual.³ In unconscious imitation of the anti-Church procedure of 1641, the Act placed every Ritualistic clergyman at the mercy of the malice or ignorance of three "aggrieved parishioners." This fraction of the congregation was empowered to hale its pastor before the lay judge for excess of ritual, the limits being measured by the recent questionable decisions of the

The
"Public
Worship
Regulation
Act."

Three
aggrieved
parish-
ioners.

¹ Notably in the case of the Ridsdale Judgment, which Sir Fitzroy Kelly did not hesitate to denounce as containing "much of policy rather than of law, though perhaps unconsciously to themselves in the majority of judges."

² Mr. Gladstone urges "the primary importance" of such proceedings not "giving rise to judgments which are founded (however unconsciously) on motives of policy more than on a dry, unbiassed consideration of the law, and which thereby suffer loss in their moral claim to respect."—Royal Supremacy, Preface, 1877.

³ As every one who kneels in prayer is a Ritualist, and nearly every rubric of the Prayer-book is a piece of Ritualism, it may be asked, why should excess be punishable by Act of Parliament rather than defect?

CHAP.
XIX.

The new
tribunal
not ac-
know-
ledged.

Present
result of
the contest.

Decisions
of the
Privy
Council
Committee.

Privy Council. The three need not be communicants, may be men of bad character, and certainly in all past cases have in no way represented the feelings of the congregation. A Puritan Association with a capital of £50,000 at once set to work to find three men of straw in the parishes where high ritual prevailed. The Anglicans, on the other hand, decided that the limits of obedience to the powers that be would be overstepped by submission to the new tribunal. The English Church Union and the Church of England Working Men's Society pledged themselves to the support of such clergymen as have introduced high ritual with the consent of their congregations. The contest is still impending. Hitherto its effect has been to show Puritanism in the darkest colours, and vastly augment the popularity of the Ritualists, four of whom have preferred imprisonment to sacrifice of principle. But above all, it has induced a conviction that a large and active body such as the Anglican Church can no longer be fettered by the caprices of aliens or indifferentists, but must at all hazards recover those rights of self-government which are now claimed by all other institutions, and which were hers before they were theirs, and are theirs because they were hers.

We append a brief summary of the most noted decisions of the Privy Council Committee.

Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter, 1850. Ruled that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration might be openly denied by a clergyman.

Liddell v. Westerton and *Liddell v. Beal*, 1857. Ruled that an altar and a cross attached to the altar was illegal; that a credence table was lawful as an adjunct to the altar; that embroidered linen and lace might not be used during the administration of the Holy Communion.

Williams v. Bishop of Salisbury and *Wilson v. Fendale*, 1864. Ruled that a clergyman might deny the inspiration of any single part of Holy Scripture, might speak of the merits of the Saviour being transferred to man as "a fiction," and might express a hope of the ultimate pardon of the damned.

Martin v. Mackonochie, 1868-70. Ruled lighted candles on the altar to be illegal when not required for the purpose of giving light. Suspended a clergyman for kneeling during the Prayer of Consecration, and elevating the paten above his head.

Hebbert v. Purchas, 1871. Ruled that a parish priest infringes the law by administering the Holy Communion in the vestments prescribed by King Edward VI.'s First Prayer-book, viz. cope, chasuble, alb, and tunicle, but that "a cope is to be worn in administering the Holy Communion on high feast days in cathedral and collegiate churches;" that wafer bread is illegal; that *public* mingling of water with the sacramental wine is illegal; that eastward celebrations are illegal when the people cannot see the act of breaking the bread.

Sheppard v. Bennett, 1871. Acquitted a clergyman who taught that "there was an actual presence of the true Body and Blood of our Lord in the consecrated bread and wine, without or external to the communicant, and separately from the act of reception;" that "the Communion table is an altar of sacrifice;" that "adoration is due to Christ present upon the altar."

Jenkins v. Cook, 1876. Ruled that a clergyman infringed the law in refusing the Sacrament to a parishioner on the ground of his denial of the eternity of punishment, and of the personality and existence of the devil.

Ridsdale v. Clifton. Appeal from Lord Penzance's Court, May, 1877. Ruled that it was illegal to celebrate Holy Communion without a congregation; that a crucifix on a chancel screen, and coloured mural reliefs representing the stations of the Cross, were illegal ornaments: confirmed the decisions on other points in *Hebbert v. Purchas*.

INDEX.

Aaron.

A

Aaron, the British Martyr, 7

Abbot, Archbp. of Canterbury, an unsatisfactory appointment, 357; revives the capital punishment of heretics, 357; guilty of manslaughter, 361; his influence ceases with death of James I., 364 sq.; refuses his imprimatur to Sibthorp's sermon, and is suspended, 367

Absolution explained to James I., 345

Absolutism, theory of, 353; maintained by the bishops of James I., 357; impugned before the Reformation, 362; unfortunate support of, by clergy of Charles I., 363; the Revolution its death-blow, 434; attempted revival of, under Anne, 447.

Addison, good influence of his writings, 449

Adrian, friend of Theodore, 34; his services to literature, 38

Advertisements, Archbp. Parker's, 315 sq.; intention of, 316, and note; summary of, 317, 318

Agatho, Pope, orders the reinstatement of Wilfrid, 40

Aggrieved parishioners, 391, 483

Aidan, mission of, 30

Alban, St., 7

Alberic, Papal legate, his intrusion on England, 79

Albigenses, the, 87 and note

Alcock, Bp. of Ely, 171

Alcuin, Egbert's librarian, 39; fame as a scholar, 39; life of, 49

Aldhelm, the poet-preacher, 49

Alfred, King, 54

Altar, converted by Ridley into a table, 226; the innovation sanctioned by Edward's government, 226; Elizabeth treats it in a spirit of compromise, 301, 302; Laud enforces ancient position, 373, 374; this is made a Puritan gravamen, 380

Altar lights, ordered in 1548, 225 note

Andrewes, Bp. of Winchester, consulted by Whitgift, 339, 356; saves Archbp. Abbot from deposition, 361

Anglo-Saxon Canons, 36, 44-46, 62; uses, 46, 48, 53

Annates, 117, 118; prohibition of, 159

Avignon.

Anselm, Archbp. of Canterbury, at issue with William II., 77; leaves England for Rome, 77, 78; embroiled with Henry I. on Investiture question, 78, 79

Antholin, S., collectors of, suppressed by Laud, 373

Apology for the oath of allegiance, James I.'s, 354

Appeals, growth of, 69-71; resisted, 102, 103; statute for restraint of, 160

Ap-Rice, Cromwell's inquisitor, 172

Archbps. confirmed by the Pope, 114, 154

Arian, controversy, 8; party in Georgian church, 455, 456

Ariminum, Council of, 8

Aristobulus, legendary British bishop, 5

Arles, Council of, 8

Arnold of Brescia, 87

Articles, the ten, 182-184; the six, of Henry VIII., 194; the eleven, 309; the forty-two drawn up by Cranmer, 231; the thirty-nine, a revision of the forty-two, 232; intention of, 232; comparison with the forty-two, 232-234; account of their final settlement, 310; disputed clauses in them, 310; made a test of loyalty, 320; Lambeth's, the, 339

Arundel's Constitutions, 129

Atonement, subjective conception of, 139, 468

Atterbury, Bp. of Rochester, defends the rights of Convocation, 442; proposes to proclaim the Pretender in 1714, 451; banished, 451 note

Augustine, S., sent by Gregory, 21; converts Ethelbert, 22; receives instructions from Gregory, 24; and a pall, 25; his ultimatum to the British bishops, 26; his work overrated, 27

Augustinian monks, the, 74

Augustin's Oak, council at, 26

Autocracy, episcopal, growth of since Reformation, 335, 336; Laud's administration an instance of, 372; reasonableness of Presbyterian proposal for its modification, 404-406; Tillotson's primacy, a flagrant case of, 441; the principle developed so as to extinguish Convocation, 452, 453; its modification by means of synods much to be desired, 477, 484

Avignon, migration of Popes to, 163, 112

Balcanqual.

B

Balcanqual, delegate to Synod of Dort, 359

Bale, chaplain to Bp. Poynt, 224

Balguy, Dr., answers Lord Shaftesbury, 459

Bancroft, Archbp. of Canterbury, his sermon at Paul's Cross, 336; the leading Churchman at Hampton Court Conference, 345; succeeds Whitgift, 350; deals severely with the Puritans, *ib.*

Bangor Iscoed, monks of, 16; massacred, 27

Baptism, British administration of, 18, 26; Augustine enforces Roman use, 26; Elfric's canon on, 61; Ten Articles on, 183; Office of, in Prayer Books of 1552, 1559, 1662, 237; lay, sanctioned till 1604, 236 note; by women, 345; denial of regeneration in, exculpated, 476, 484

Baptism, Infant, Wall's history of, 449

Barlow, Bp. of Chichester, a violent reforming preacher, 210; assists at Parker's consecration, 303.

Barnes, a Lutheran, burnt, 198

Baro, Peter, an Arminian, 339

Baronial tenure of bishops, 72

Barrett, William, an Arminian, 338

Barrow, Dr., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 420.

Barton, Elizabeth, her revelations and death, 164

Basle, Council of, 123

Bastwick, the libeller, 371; compensated, 382

Baxter, the Puritan, declines a bishopric at the Restoration, 407, a delegate at Savoy Conference, 407 note; his Reformed Liturgy, 408 note; his Saint's Everlasting Rest, 419

Becket, Thomas, his career as a courtier, 81; made Archbp. of Canterbury, 82; heads the Church party, 82; the champion of Constitutional Government, 83; coerced to sign the Constitutions of Clarendon, 84; his six years' contest with Henry II., 84, 85; his murder, 85; his shrine insulted by Henry VIII., 179

Bede, the Venerable, 38, 39; his life, 47, 48

Bellarmino's description of 15th century Church, 134

Benedict Biscop, 39

Benedictine monks, the, 51; restored at S. James Chapel, 425

Bennett, Shepherd *versus*, 1871, decision in, 482, 485

Benson, Bp. of Gloucester, ordains Whitefield, 463

Bentley, Master of Trinity, writes against Collins, 457

Berkeley, Bp. of Cloyne (1733), writes against Collins, 457; the Alciphron, 459

Berridge of Everton, Evangelical clergyman, 469

Beveridge, Bp. of S. Asaph (1704), declines to succeed Ken at Bath and Wells, 436; one of the great divines of Queen Anne's reign, 449, 460, 463

Breakspear.

Bible, translations of: Bede's, 48 note; Wyclif's, 123; Sir T. More on earlier versions, 123 note; Wyclif's suppressed, 129; Tyndal's, 165; Matthew's, 187; set up in the churches, 187, 198; Cranmer's, 198, 199; the Geneva, 308, 309, 347; the Bishops', 308, 347; those in use on accession of James I., 347; summary of English translations of, 349 note; the Bible of 1611, its history, 347, 348; circulation of, 419, 470, 88 note

Bigod, Roger, at Council of Lyons, 98

Bingham, Joseph, his Antiquities of the Christian Church, 449

Bird, Bp. of Chester, deprived, 252

Birinus, missionary, 31

Bishops, numerous in British Church, 15; Anglo-Saxon, preside in county courts, 43; popular election of, 62; in conflict with the monks, 88; become autocrats, 336; the ten, mobbed and imprisoned, 385; the seven, imprisoned, tried, and acquitted, 431, 432

Bishops *in partibus*, numerous in 13th century, 104; Romish, in England, 320 note; established by James II., 424

Bishop's Book, *see* "Institution, etc."

Bishoprics, Anglo-Saxon, organisation of, 36, 37

Black Bartholomew's, 411, 412

Blackhall, Bp. of Exeter, preaches passive obedience, 447

Blomfield, Bp. of London, 471 note

Bocher, Joan, heretic, burnt, 229

Böhler, Peter, Moravian missionary, 463; influence of, on Wesley, *ib.*

Boleyn, Anne, Henry's marriage with, 149, 150

Bolingbroke's posthumous works, 458

Boniface, S., instigator of the Synod of 747, 42; the apostle of Germany—encourages Papal encroachment—his death, 50

Boniface VIII., Pope, 102, 103

Bonner, Bp. of London, protests against the injunctions and homilies, 213; is imprisoned and released, 214; is ordered to preach against the rebels, 225; is imprisoned again, 226; is released, 243; takes a leading part in the Marian persecution, 266; housed with Bp. of Lincoln, 298; placed within the rule of the Marshalsea prison, 298

Book of Sports of James I., 359; republication of, 377; to be sanctioned by the clergy, 377

Bounty, Queen Anne's, institution of, 444

Bourne, one of Mary's chaplains, 244; refuses to help in Parker's consecration, 303

Boyle, Mr., president of a society for the propagation of the Gospel, 419

Bradbury, Mr., dissenting preacher, 456

Bradford, reformer, imprisoned, 255

Bray, Dr., a founder of the S. P. C. K. and S. P. G. 443

Breakspear, Nicholas, the only English Pope, 80

Bristol.

- Bristol, bishopric founded at, 178
 Bristol, the Methodist preachers at, 464
 British Church, *see* Celtic
 British and Foreign School Society, the, 470
 Brooks, Bp. of Gloucester, Papal commissioner to try Cranmer, 269
 Brown, Robert, founder of the Independents, 329
 Brownists, *see* Independents
 Bruys, Peter de, 87
 Bucer, a foreign Protestant at Cambridge, 214; his remains insulted, 276
 Bull, Bp. of St. David (1705), author of "Defensio fidei Nicenæ," 420, 453
 Bulls, Papal, prohibited, 117, 155
 Bunyan denounces the declaration for liberty of conscience, 428
 Burial Laws' Amendment Act of 1880, 480
 Burial of the dead, office for, in the several prayer books, 233
 Burnell, Bp. of Bath, author of "Statute of Mortmain," 100
 Burnet, Gilbert, Bp. of Salisbury, at Dutch Court, 437; reads William's Declaration, 434; consecrated by a commission of Sancroft's appointment, 436; a Latitudinarian, 437, 441; opposes rights of Convocation, 442; opposes Act against Occasional Conformity, 446
 Burton, the libeller, 371; compensated, 382
 Bush, Bp. of Bristol, deprived, 252
 Butler, Bp. of Durham, his Analogy, 459



Cadoc, Welsh missionary, 12

- Caedmon, 48
 Caerleon, Welsh archbishopric, 6, 8, 15
 Calamy (elder) the Presbyterian, 403, 407
 Calamy (younger) the Presbyterian, 457
 Calcuith, Council of, 42
 Calendar, the, of 1549, 305; of 1552, 306; of 1561, 306
 Calne, Council at, 60
 Calvin, the reformer, 139; advises Somerset to execute heretics, 229
 Calvinism of later Elizabethan Churchmen, 338-340; James's support of, 359; five points of, 359 *sq.*; is successfully impugned by the Caroline divines, 420; of Whitefield, 464, 465; of the Evangelicals, 468
 Cambridge University harassed by James II., 428, 429
 Camden Society at Cambridge, 474
 Camisards or "French Prophets," 460
 Campeggio, Cardinal, 143
 Canons, the, of 1604, 351; of 1640, 380, 384, 428
 Canute, 61
 Caractacus, 5
 Carleton, Bp. of Llandaff, sent to Synod of Dort, 359
 Caroline books, the, 49
 Caroline divines, celebrated for intellectual ability, 407, 419, 420

Christchurch.

- Carthusian monks, 74
 Cartwright, Bp. of Chester, refuses the oath to William III., 435
 Cartwright, Margaret Professor, 321; his first and second admonition, 322
 "Case of Allegiance due," &c. Sherlock's, 436
 "Case of Resistance," &c. Sherlock's, 436
 Case, the Puritan, 403, 407
 Castro, Alphonso de, chaplain to Philip II., 266 *sq.*
 Catharine of Aragon, *see* Henry VIII.
 Cathedral Chapters remodelled by Dunstan, 60; by Lanfranc, 74; by Henry VIII., 178
 Cathedrals, Norman, 75
 Cecil, Mr., the Evangelical, 470
 Cedda, 30, 31
 Celibacy, clerical, a theory rather than a practice in Anglo-Saxon Church, 44; measures taken to enforce, by Odo and Dunstan, 58, 59; ordered by Council of Winchester, 76; the rule evaded in Anglo-Norman Church, 76, 77; enforced by the Six Articles, 195; nearly being reinforced under Edward VI., 218, 219; denounced by the imprisoned divines in 1554, 255; established by Mary, 252, 253; prejudice in favour of, 219, 300
 Celtic Church, 1-19; peculiarities of, 13-16
 Centralising system, Roman account of, 63, 114
 Chad, consecration and deposition of, 35
 Chaderton, Mr., the Puritan, 345
 Chandler, Dr., writes against Collins, the Deist, 459
 Chantries, appropriation of, under Edward VI., 209
 Characteristics of Men and Manners, Shaftesbury's, 457
 Charles I., his character and principles, 363; his ecclesiastical policy, 364; at issue with Parliaments, 366-370; governs without parliament, 370-372; his absolutism in Church matters, 372; his republication of the Book of Sports, 377; sends canons to Scotch Church, 378; his Short Parliament, 379, 380; his Long Parliament, 381 *sq.*; his half-hearted policy with regard to the Church, 385, 386; his self-sacrifice on the Church's behalf, 390, 391
 Charles II., receives Puritan deputation at the Hague, 403; issues the Worcester House Declaration, 406; summons the Savoy Conference, 407; his policy, 414, 415; offers indulgence to dissenters, 415, 416; really wishes to get concessions for Romanism, 414, 417; effects of the reign, 418-420
 Charter, the Great, 91
 Chester, bishopric founded at, 178
 Chicheley, Archbp. of Canterbury, 171
 Chillingworth, William, a Latitudinarian, 420, 455
 Christchurch, Canterbury, monks of, claim to elect Primate, 88, 89

Christianity.

- "Christianity as old as the Creation," Tindal's, 458
 Christianity, decline of, at close of 15th cent., 134; and in the Georgian period, 459, 460
 Chubb, Thomas, the Deist, 458, 459
 Church and State, set at variance in Anglo-Norman period, 66 sq.; mutual relations of, 212; how far affected by modern constitutional changes, 68, 479
 Church Association, the, 483
 Church, continuity of, 1 and note, 141, 142, 279-285
 Church Missionary Society, the, 470
 Church of England Working Men's Society, 484
 Church rates in Anglo-Saxon Church, 44
 Church restoration, in reign of Charles II., 419; not thought of during the Evangelical movement, 471; inspired by the Tractarian movement, 475, 479
Circumspecte Agatis, the, 101
 Cistercian monks, the, 75
 Clarendon, Constitutions of, 82, 83
 Clarendon, Lord, 416
 Clarke, Dr. S., his writings censured by Convocation, 445, 455; career of, 455 note; his Arian Prayer-Book, 456
 Claudia and Pudens, legend of, 5
 Clemens Romanus on S. Paul's mission to the West, 4
 Clergy, immunities of, 80 sq.; scarcity of under Elizabeth, their degradation, 306, 307; state of, under James I., 358; under Anne, 444; under the Georges, 471
Clericus Laicos, the, 102
 Cloveshoo, meeting place of the yearly synod, 36; synod of 747, 42
 Cluniac monks, the, 74
 Cobham, Lord, 128, 129
 Coelestine, Pope, sends Palladius and Patrick to Ireland, 11, 12
 Colchester, Colonel, a founder of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G., 443
 Colenso, Bp. of Natal, 476
 Colet, the reformer, 135, 147
 Collier, Jeremy, the Church historian, a Non-Juror, 436; consecrated by Hickeys and Scotch bishops, heads the party of "Usagers," 436 note
 Collins, Anthony, the Deist, 457, 458
 Colman, the Celtic bishop, 32
 Colonial Episcopate, disallowed by the Georgian ministries, Wesley's, 467; Dr. Seabury consecrated in Scotland, 467 note; extension of, since 1825, 478
 Columban, S., mission to Scotland, 12
 Commendams, action about James I.'s claim to grant, 358
 Commendone, Papal envoy to England, 245
 Commission of search for Church property, 1552, 240
 Committee for preferments, William III.'s, 443
 Committee of religion, the Puritan, 384

Convocation.

- Committees for scandalous ministers, 391, 392; for plundered ministers, 392
 Commons, House of, its modern formation hostile to the Church's interests, 479, 480
 Communion, controversy about, under Edward VI., 215; Cranmer's views of, 215; in both kinds allowed, *ib.*; sacrificial character of, emphasised in Missal of 1548 more than in subsequent offices, 216 note; controversy at Oxford on, 220; office for, in Prayer-book of 1552, 235; office for, in Prayer-book of 1549, 236; office for, in several Prayer-books, 237
 Compton, Bp. of London, denounces policy of James II., 423; declines to suspend Dr. Sharp, 425; suspended by the High Commission Court, 426; signs the invitation to William, 432
 Confirmation, British office of, 18; office in the several Prayer-books, 238; explained to James I., 345
 Congé d'Elire, in the præ-Reformation period, 161; suppression of, 208 and note; its re-establishment, 253
 Congregationalists, *see* Independents
 "Connection of Sacred and Pagan History," Humphrey Prideaux's, 449
 Constance, Council of, 133
 Constantine's donation, 57
 Conventicle Act, 1st, 415
 Conventicle Act, 2nd, 416
 Convention Parliaments, the, 406, 434
 Convocation, the Church's tax-paying agency, 95; but difficult to distinguish from Parliament, 96; its ancient organisation still survives, 96, 97; Wolsey proposes to amalgamate the Houses of, 145, 146; a verdict on the Divorce question wrung from, 153; acknowledges the royal supremacy with a qualification, 156; unjustly fined by Henry VIII., 156, 157; petitions against Annates, 159; suggests the severance from Rome, 159; Cromwell presides at, 182; accepts the Ten Articles, 183; disallows the Pope's power to summon a council, 184; its connection with the "Bishops' Book," 185, 186; sanctions Henry's Six Articles, 194, 195; sanctions the "King's Book," 200; overridden by Cranmer, 212, 232; sanctions Prayer-book of 1549, 217; but not the Prayer-book of 1552, 218; reactionary on the accession of Mary, 251; absolved by Pole, 261; pleads vainly for restoration of Church property, 261; its petition in 1558, 277; prejudiced against reformatory measures, 291; Prayer-book revised without its sanction, 292; its Puritan members oppose the Thirty-nine Articles, 310; they wish to authorise Nowell's Catechism, 312; and petition against Church's ritual, 312, 313; overridden by the 16th cent. primates, 336; does not sanction the Prayer-book revision of 1604, 346, 347; passes the Canons of 1604, 351, 352; exculpates Laud as a Synod by the Canons of 1640, 380;

Conybeare.

resigns its powers of self-taxation, 414; ignored by William III.'s government as long as possible, 440; Tillotson's suppression of, provokes the Convocation controversy, 441, 442; the Lower at issue with the Upper House, 442, 445; business done in 1711, 445; suppression of, under George I., 452-454; revival of, in the present reign, 477

Conybeare, Dr., answers Tyndal, the Deist, 459

Conyers, Mr., the Evangelical, 470

Corporate action of Anglo-Saxon clergy, 41, 42

Cosin, Bp. of Durham, declared superstitious and scandalous, 382; raised to the episcopate, 407; at Savoy Conference, 407; one of the committee for review of Prayer-book, 410; the Prayer-book adapted in accordance with his suggestions, 410, 411

Courtenay, Archbp. of Canterbury, 122

Court of Delegates, the, 481

Courts, ecclesiastical, 72-101

Coverdale, Bp. of Exeter, imprisoned under Mary, 249; assists at Parker's consecration, 303; his Bible translations, 349 note

Cowell, Dr., a Puritan author, 353

Cox, Bp. of Ely, 290, 304

Cranmer, rise of, 152; made Archbp. of Canterbury and divorces Henry VIII. from Catharine, 153, 154; gets a Papal Bull for his consecration, 155; examines Elizabeth Barton, 164; acquiesces in the visitation of monasteries, 173; helps to compose the Ten Articles, 182; condemns Lambert, 193; his Bible, 198, 347; unpopularity of, 204; is indifferent to Somerset's spoliation, 206; inclines to the doctrine of consubstantiation, 206; modification of his religious opinions, 207; morally weak, 207; his two great principles, 208; gets a licence from Edward VI.; secures the abolition of the Congé d'Elire, 208; vindicated from Erastianism by Dean Hook, 209; influenced by the foreign Protestants, 214, 232; view of communion modified, 215; unfair treatment of Bp. Gardiner in controversy, 221; his connection with the *Reformatio Legum*, 239; joins in Lady Jane's conspiracy, 242; is ordered to keep his house, 244; refuses to fly, 248; his indiscreet manifesto, 248; is imprisoned, 248; his share in Henry's divorce exposed, 250, 251; moved to Oxford and compelled to dispute, 254; disowns transubstantiation, 254; condemned, 255; appears before Bp. Brooks, 269; condemned by the Pope and degraded, 273; induced to recant, 274; renounces his recantations, 274, 275; burnt, 275

Crewe, Bp. of Durham, 424 note; one of the High Commission Court, 426

Criminals, clerical, tried in Anglo-Saxon Civil Courts, 48; but in Ecclesiastical

Drake.

Courts under William I., 72; consequent disputes in the reign of Henry II., 80, 81

Crome, the Reformer, 255

Cromwell, Oliver, his Protectorate, 399; his persecution of Churchmen, 399 sq.; his overtures to the clergy, 400; ejects sequestered clergy from tuitional offices, 400, 401

Cromwell, Thomas, rise of, 167, 168; becomes Vicar-General, 168; his visitation of monasteries, 168-178; presides at Convocation, 182-185; encourages disorderly Protestantism, 191; his fall, 197

D

Davenant, delegate to Synod of Sort, 359

David, S., 12

Day, Bp. of Chichester, imprisoned under Edward VI., 227

Declaration attached to the Articles, 368; by Charles I.

Declaration of Indulgence, Charles II.'s, 416

Declaration of Indulgence, James II.'s, 427; to be read in the churches, 430

Declaration of Rights, the, 434

Decretals, the false, 56, 57

"Defender of the Faith," title of, 149

De Hæreticis Comburendis, the, 127

Deists, the so-called, 457-459

Deprivation of bishops and clergy, 295

De Religiosis, the, 100, 101

Desecration of church ornaments, 211

De Unitate, Pole's, 198, 245 note

Deusdedit, Archbp. of Canterbury, 34, 35

Directory of public worship, the, 387

Disputation at Westminster, 1559, 296, 297

Dissenters, take orders, 314; fall into sectarian formations, 328-330; Charles II. coquets with, 415, 416; number of, in 1676, 413; James II. wins, by offers of Indulgence, 422, 428; William III. gives immunity to, under certain limitations, 438; statutes against, under Anne, 446; indulgence of, under George I., 452, 456, 457; freed from all restrictions, 479; harass the Church, 479 sq.; numbers of, conjectured, 480 note

Divine right, doctrine of, under James I., 358; maintained by Laud and other divines, under Charles I., 363, 367, 368; under Charles II., 418; maintained by a few bishops under James II., 424; revived by the Tories under Queen Anne, 447

Divorce, Henry the Eighth's, 149-154; Cranmer's part in, exposed, 250, 251

Doctrines in Anglo-Saxon Church, 46

Dodwell, Henry, Camden Professor, a Non-Juror, 436

Dominicans, the, 107-109

Domínick de Guzman, 106

Dort, the Synod of, 359, 360

Dowsing, William, in the eastern counties, 395

Drake, Dr., his "Memorial of the Church of England," 447

Dunstan.

- Dunstan, Archbp. of Canterbury, his early history, 59; career at court, 86.; primacy, ousts the secular clergy, 60
 Du Pin, correspondence with Archbp. Wake, 454
 Duppa, Bp. of Exeter, ordains at Richmond, 401

II

- Eadbold converted, 28
 Eanfleda, Queen of Oswy, observes the Continental Easter, 32
 Easter, British computation of, 17, 26, 32
 Ecclesiastical laws of William I., 68
 E-kart, the mystic, 126
 Eldius, account of Wilfrid, 40
 Edward the Confessor, extolled by monks; unpatriotic administration of, 62
 Edward I., ecclesiastical policy of, 99-103
 Edward VI., precocity of, 205; the bishops take licences from, 208; maladministration of his government, 222 sq.; evil effects of his reign on religion, 208, 224, 240
 Egbert, Archbp. of York, 46, 48
 Eleutherius, mission to Britain, 6
 Elfric, the homilist, 56, 60, 61
 Elizabeth, Queen, under restraint in Mary's reign, 256; religious status at accession of, 279 sq.; her religious opinions, 281 sq.; her coronation, 287; claims only to be "Supreme Governor," 289; reclaims first-fruits and tenths, 290; desires a higher standard of ritual, 295; establishes Court of High Commission, 298; her injunctions, 299-301; her appointment of a Primate, 302 sq.; her treatment of the Puritan divines, 305; her modifications of the thirty-nine Articles, 310; her half-hearted support of the Church—due to Leicester's influence, 314, 315; gives no sanction to the Advertisements, 316; her suspension of Archbp. Grindal, 326, 327; receives a rebuke from Whitgift, 331; supports Whitgift as archbp., 334
 Engagement, the Independent, enforced, 395, 398
 English Church Union, the, 484
 Episcopacy, attacked in Parliament, 384; abolished, 386; wise reform of, suggested by Puritans, 404
 Episcopate, extension of, a necessity, 162, 478
 Erasmus, 148
 Erastianism, Cranmer's inclination to, 209; growth of, under Elizabeth, 336
 Erigena, John Scotus, 54, 55
 "Erudition of any Christian Man," 199, 200
 Essays and Reviews, exculpated, 476-484
 Essex, conversion of, 23 sq.
 Et cætera, oath, 381
 Ethelbert, conversion of, 22, 23
 Ethelburga converted, 28
 Eusebius's account of Christianity in Britain, 3
 Evangelical movement, the, 468 472; its

Frithona.

- great names, 469, 470; its institutions, 470; its failure to stir the Church, 470-472; some of the party join in the Puritan persecution of Tractarians, 475; and of Ritualists, 477; but most learn to sympathise with the revival of Anglicanism, 477
 Exclusion, Bill of, 418, 420
 Excommunication, lay, explained to James I., 345
 F
 Fagius, Paul, a Protestant at Cambridge, 214; his remains insulted, 276
 Fairfax, Dr., Fellow of Magdalene, Oxford, deprived, 429
 Falkland's opinion of episcopal autocracy, 405 note
 Familists, the, 329, 330, 399
 Farmer, Anthony, nominated by James II. to be president of Magdalene, Oxford, 429
 Fasting, declared not meritorious under Edward VI., 220
 Feckenham, abbot of Westminster, talked of for the primacy, 303 and note
 Felix, the missionary, 31
 Fell, Bp. of Oxford, helps to suppress Monmouth's insurrection, 423
 Fenner, the marprelate libeller, 334
 Ferrar, Bp. of St. David's, deprived, 252; burnt, 268
 Feudal tenure of bishops under William I., 72
 Fifth Monarchists, 399
 First-fruits and tenths, restored by Mary, 275; taken back by Elizabeth, 290; ceded to the Church by Anne, 444
 Fisher, Bp. of Rochester, educational reformer, 148; opposes the divorce, 151; averse to royal supremacy, 163; made cardinal, 165; done to death under Treason Act, 157, 165; career of, 166, 167
 Fitzjocelyn, Archbp. of Canterbury, 77
 Fitzralph, Archbp. of Armagh, 118 and note
 Fletcher, Mr., of Madeley, the evangelical, 469
 Fox, Bp. of Winchester, 148
 Frampton, Bp. of Gloucester, preaches against popery under James II., 425; deprived as a Non-Juror, 435 note
 Francis, S., of Assisi, 106
 Francis, Allan, sent by James II. to Cambridge, 428
 Franciscans, the, 106-109
 Frederick I., his negotiations with the English Church, 449, 450
 Freedom of Church guaranteed by the Great Charter, 91
 Frewen, Archbp. of York, 410
 Friars, the mendicant, revival of religion by, 105, 106; their success in England, 107; they become demoralised, 108; and end as university pedants, 109
 "Friends of God," the, 126
 Frithona, see Deusdedit

Froude.

- Froude, Mr., the Tractarian, 474
 Fryth, the Lutheran, 166; burnt by More, 192
 Fursy, the missionary, 31

G

- Gardiner**, Bp. of Winchester, a leader of the old learning party, 181, 204; not included in the council, 205; pleads for the retention of images and holy water, 210, 211; maintains the liberties of the Church, 212, 213; is imprisoned and deprived, 213; refuses to sign a confession of guilt, 227; released from prison, 243; becomes privy councillor under Mary, 243; a commissioner to try heretics, 268; resigns the post, 268
Garentin, monk, a Lollard martyr, 128
Gastrell, Bp. of Chester, 1714, answers Dr. Clarke, 456
Gauden, Bp. of Exeter, 407 and note
Gaul, Church of, its connection with British Church, 6
Gaunt, John of, patronizes Wyclif, 120 sq.
Gerard, a Lutheran, burnt, 198
Gerhard, Walter, leader of the Publicani, 86
Germanus in Britain, 10
Gerson, the mystic, 126
Gibbon, the sceptic, 458; answered by Bp. Watson, 459
Gibson, Bp. of London, writes against Woolston, the Deist, 459
Giffard, Bonaventure, Bp. of Madura, placed at Magdalene, Oxford, 430
Gildas, Welsh missionary, 12
Gladstone, Mr. W. E., on the Church of forty years ago, 472; on persecution of Ritualism, 475 note; on the new Supreme Court of Appeal, 481; on proceedings in ecclesiastical cases, 483 note
Glastonbury, Legend, 5; the school at, 59; Dunstan's Benedictine Monastery at, 59
Gloucester, bishopric founded at, 178
Goodrich, Bp. of Ely, 181
Gorham judgment, the, 476, 484
Gostwick, Sir John, accuses Cranmer, 204
Greek, revival of, 134, 135
Gregorian chants, 74
Gregory I., sees Anglo-Saxon boys at Rome, 20; sets out on a mission to England, 21; sends Augustine, 21 sq.
Gregory VII., Pope, magnifies the assumptions of the Decretals; claim to be Suzerain of Europe, 69; is resisted by William I., 73
Gregory IX., his encroachments in England, 97
Grey, John de, Bp. of Norwich, 89
Grey, Lady Jane, usurpation of, 242, 243
Grindal, Archbp. of Canterbury: consecrated Bp. of London, 304; succeeds Matthew Parker, 324; his puritanical proclivities, 325; falls foul of the queen in the matter of prophesyings, 325, 326; is suspended, 327

Hertford.

- Grocyn, the reformer, 135, 148
Grosseteste, Bp. of Lincoln, resists Papal encroachments, 98, 99; encourages scriptural study, 123 note
Guest, Bp. of Rochester, 296, 305
Guildford, Lord, a founder of the S. P. C. K. and S. P. G., 443

H

- Hackington**, monastery at, 89
Hague, Puritan deputation to, 403
Hales, Mr. A., promotes the negotiations with Dr. Jablonski, 450
Hales, Sir Edward, mock trial of, 424
Hall, Bp. of Exeter, sent to Synod of Dort, 359
Hallam, Bp. of Salisbury, 133
Hallelujah victory, 10
Hamerken, the mystic, 126
Hamilton, Bp. of Galloway, 355
Hammond, Dr. Henry, keeps up church life during the interregnum, 401; his "Practical Catechism," 419
Hampton Court Conference, 345 sq.
Harley, the reformer, Bp. of Hereford, 253
Hatfield, council at, in 680, 39
Heath, Bp. of Worcester, imprisoned under Edward VI., 227; released, 243
Heathen practices, how treated by Saxon Christianity, 45
Hebbert v. Purchas, 485
Henricians, the, 87
Henry I., dispute with Anselm, 78
Henry II., the dispute about clerical immunity, 80; his appointment of Becket, 82; the six years' contest, 84, 85; cedes the points at issue after Becket's murder, 85
Henry III., 94-99
Henry VIII., marriage with Catharine, 136, 137; applies for a divorce, 149-154; marries Anne Boleyn, 154; claims to be supreme head of the Church, 156; his Treason Act, 157; anti-papal statutes, 158-162; private negotiations with Rome, 160, 161; his dissolution of the monasteries, 168-178; is excommunicated, 179; his religious opinions, 180; his ten Articles, 182-184; his injunctions, 185, 187; his contempt for the Protestants, 188, 189; his policy towards the two religious parties, 189-194; his six Articles, 194 sq.; his "English Primer," 201; his will, 205
Heptarchy, Church of, consolidated, 33 sq.
Herbert, Lord Chief Justice, 424
Herbert of Cherbury, Lord, a Deist writer, 457
Heretics, British, 9; in 12th cent., 86, 87; legislation against in 15th cent., 127 sq.; burnt under Henry VIII., 191-193, 198 sq.; burnt under Edward VI., 229; Reformatio Legum on punishment of, 240; law against, under Mary, 263 sq.; two, burnt by James I., 357
Hertford, synod at, in 673, 36
Hertford, Lord, *see* Somerset

Hervey.

Hervey, Mr., of Wellyn, the evangelical, 470

Hickes, George, Dean of Worcester, a Non-juror, 436; consecrated as Bp. of Thetford, 436 note

High Commission, the Court of, its institution in 1559, 298, 299; its encroachment on the functions of the secular courts, under James I., 353; its employment by Charles I., 370 *sq.*; declared incapable of existence at Restoration, 425; yet practically restored by James II., 426; proceedings of, 426, 428, 429, 432; dissolved by James, 433

Hilary on British orthodoxy, 9

Hildebrand, *see* Gregory VII.

Hill, Rowland, the evangelical, 470

Hilsey, Bp. of Rochester, author of a "Primer," 201

Hoddy, Bp. of Bangor, etc., writes in reply to Blackhall's sermon, 447; promoted for his Erastian opinions, 453; his sermon censured in Convocation, 453; this causes the suspension of Convocation, 453; and the Bangorian controversy, 455; writes against Anthony Collins, 457

Hubbes, Thomas, a Deist writer, 457

Hodgkins, bishop-suffragan of Bedford, assists at Parker's consecration, 303

Holgate, Archbp. of York, imprisoned under Mary, 249; deprived, 252; released, 256

Hollis, Mr., a Puritan M.P., 369

Holywood, Christopher, author of the Nags-head fable, 304

Homage, to Pope refused by William I., 73; to kings by prelates, 78 *sq.*

"Homilies of Elfric," 60

"Humilies, First Book of," 202; enforced by the Injunctions of Edward VI., 211; second book of, sanctioned by Convocation, 311, 312

Hook, Justice, a founder of the S. P. C. K. and S. P. G., 443

Hooker, master of the Temple, 337; his "Ecclesiastical Polity," 337

Hooper, an admirer of Northumberland, 224; made Bp. of Gloucester, 230; his Puritan objections to the episcopal vestments, *ib.*; imprisoned by Cranmer and submits, and is consecrated, 231; imprisoned under Mary, 249; deprived, 253; burnt, 268

Horsley, Bp. of St. David's, etc., answers Dr. Priestly, 456

Hough, Dr., elected President of Magdalene, Oxford, 429

Howe, the dissenter, 428

Hume, sceptic, 458; answered by Dr. Paley, 459

Humphreys, Dr., the Puritan, 319

Hunn, Richard, a disorderly Protestant, 190 *sq.*

Huntingdon, Countess of, a patroness of Whitefield, her connexion, 466

Hy, monastic college at, 13; missionaries sent from, 30

James II.

I

Images, controversy on use of, 52, 53
Alfred's view of, 54; the Ten Articles on, 183; the Injunctions of 1538 on, 188; defended by Gardiner, 210; destroyed by Somerset, 211; destruction of, by the Commission of 1559, 299; Elizabeth's use of, 305

Impropriations, lay, sanctioned by Cardinal Pole, 262

Ina, founds English College at Rome, 53
Independents, the, origin of, 329; in the ascendant, 397; intolerant character of, 397, 398

Indulgences, traffic in, 110, 111

Injunctions, the first of Edward VI., 211; the second of Edward VI., 225; Mary's, 245; Elizabeth's, 299-301

Innocent III., Pope, extends papal assumptions, 92, 93

Innocent XI., Pope, gives no support to James II., 422

"Innovations," Laud's religious, 372 *sq.*

Inquisition founded, 88; system of, imported by Philip II., 264 *sq.*

"Institution of a Christian Man," 185, 186

Interregnum, the, 397-402

Investiture of bishops, 62; controversy about, 78

Iona, *see* Hy

Ireland, Welsh mission to, 12

Isidore's decretals, 56

J

Jablouski's negotiations with the English Church, 449

Jacobite proclivities of the clergy, 451 *sq.*

James I., his dislike of the Presbyterians, 341; his character and views, 342; behaviour at the Hampton Court Conference, 345; suggests the English Bible of 1611, 347; appoints translators, 348; favours the theory of Absolutism, 353; his apologies for the oath of allegiance, 354; restores episcopacy to Scotland, 355, 356; appoints Abbot to the Primacy, 356, 357; burns two heretics, 357; his Book of Sports, 359; sends delegates to the Synod of Dort, *ib.*; extends toleration to the Romanists, 360; bad effects of his reign, 361

James II., indebted to the clergy for his accession, 418, 422; alliance with Penn., 422; not supported by Rome, *ib.*; his coronation, 422, 423; announces intention of retaining Romanist officers, 423; relies on loyalty of clergy, 424; gives Church preferment to Romanists, 424; revives High Commission Court, 426; suspends Bp. Compton, 426; issues the Declaration for Liberty of Conscience, 427; extolled by the dissenters, 428; his aggressions at the Universities, 428-430;

Jaye.

dismissal of lords lieutenants, 430; orders the declaration to be read in Church, 430; is disobeyed, 431; sends the bishops to trial for libel, 432; seeks counsel of the bishops, 433

Jaye, George, author of a Primer, 201

Jeffreys, Lord Chancellor, 426, 429

Jenkins v. Cook, 485

Jerome, a Lutheran, burnt, 198

Jewel, Bp., his "Apology," 307, 308

John, King, persecution of the Church, 90 sq.

Joseph of Arimathea, legend of, 5

Julius, supposed martyr, 7

Julius, III., Pope, negotiates with Mary, 245; secretly appoints Pole legate to England, 246; his bargain with Mary, 257

Justin Martyr, account of Christianity in Britain, 3

Justus, Bp. of Rochester, 23; Archbp. of Canterbury, 28

Juxon, Archbp. of Canterbury, at Savoy Conference, 407; receives order for review of Prayer-book, 410

K

Keble, Mr. a Tractarian, his "Christian Year," 474

Kempis, Thomas à, 126

Ken, Bp. of Bath and Wells, denounces Romanism under James II., 425; one of the Seven Bishops, 431, 432; refuses the oath to William, 435; receives a year of grace, *ib.*; retires under protest, 436

Kent, conversion of, 22 sq.

Kettlewell, John, the Non-Juror, 436

Kiffin, the dissenter, 428

"King's Book," see "Necessary Erudition"

Kitchin, Bp. of Llandaff, takes the oath of supremacy, 297

Knewstubs, Mr., the Puritan, 345

Knox, a Scotch Reformer, inveighs against Edward VI.'s government, 206

L

Lake, Bp. of Chichester, one of the Seven Bishops, 431, 432; a Non-Juror, 435

Lamb, Bp. of Brechin, 355

Lambert, burnt by Cranmer, 193

Lamplugh, Archbp. of York, conduct at Exeter, 434

Lanfranc, Archbp. of Canterbury, Abbot of Bec, 68; oppresses the Anglo-Saxon clergy, 74; imitates William's policy as regards Rome, 73

Langland, author of "Piers Ploughman's Vision," 118, 119

Langton, Archbp. of Canterbury, favourite of Innocent III., 90; leads the patriot party, 90, 91; suspended by Innocent III., 92; holds his own against Rome, 92, 97

Lasco, John à, a foreign Protestant in London, 214; his formulae incorporated in our Communion office, 235, 236

Luther.

Lateran Council of 1215, 92

Latimer, Bp. of Worcester, 181; resigns when the Six Articles are enforced, 194; a true reformer, denounces Edward's government, 224; compelled to dispute at Oxford, 253, 254; is condemned, 255; and burnt, 270; biography of, 272, 273

Laud, Archbp. of Canterbury, a favourite of Prince Charles, 365; raised to bishopric of St. David's, 365; is practically primate, 363, 365 sq.; officiates at the Coronation, 365; wants the Church to disown Calvinism, 365, 368; account of his administration, 370; becomes Bp. of London and Primate, 372; not really a persecutor, 372; but a great religious reformer, 372; account of his proceedings, 372-376; falsely charged with Romanism, 375; attacked by the Long Parliament, 382; sent to the Tower, 382; his unfair trial, 389; condemned by Bill of Attainder and executed, 390

Laurentius, Archbp. of Canterbury, 27

Law, William, a Non-Juror, 436; his "Serious Call" and "Christian Perfection," 460, 462; his tendency towards mysticism, 460; influence of, on John Wesley and others, 462

Lawyers, clerical, 104

Lay Helpers in Elizabeth's reign, 307

Lee, Archbp. of York, leader of the old learning party, 181

Legate, Bartholomew, burnt for heresy, 357

Legate, the English Primate, *legatus natus*, 37 note, 113, 114

Leicester, Earl, a professed Puritan, 313 sq.

Leigh, Cromwell's inquisitor, 172

Leighton, Cromwell's inquisitor, 172

Leighton, the libeller, 371

Leslie, Charles, the controversialist, a Non-Juror, 436

Lessons, the Table of, 1561, 305

Libellers, the Marprelate, 334, 335; the Puritan, punished by the Star Chamber, 371, 372

Lichfield, archbishopric of, 42, 51, 52

Liddell v. Westerton, and Liddell v. Beal, 484

Litany, the English, 200

Lloyd, Bp. of St. Asaph, one of the Seven Bishops, 431, 432; deprived as a Non-Juror, 435 note; heads the schism, 436 and note

Lollard movement, the, 125, 126; its disorderly character, 125; legislation against, 127-129

London, Cromwell's inquisitor, 172

Long Parliament, 381 sq.

Lords Lieutenants dismissed by James II., 430

Lucius, British king, mission to, 5

Lupus, Bp. of Troyes, 10

Luther, protests against Roman abuses, 138; character of his system, 140; dogmatizes on relative value of Scriptures, 140; answered by Henry VIII., 146, 149

Lyons.

Lyons, Council of, 98
 Lyons, Poor men of, 87, 88

IV

Mackworth, Sir H., a founder of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G., 443
Magdalene College, Oxford, severities of James II. at, 429, 430
Maintenance of clergy, Anglo-Saxon, provisions for, 44
Mainwaring, Dr., preaches in behalf of Absolutism, 368
Manning, Cardinal, and others, secession of, 476
Manton, the Puritan, 403
"Martin Marprelate" libels, the, 334 sq.
Martin v. Mackonochie, 484
Martyrs, British, 7, 8
Mary, Queen, persecuted under the reign of Edward VI., 228; and passed over by Edward's will, 242; Lady Jane Grey's rebellion against, 242; is enthusiastically received in London, 243; suppresses all preaching, 245; Wyatt's rebellion against, 251; her injunctions to the clergy, 245, 252; deprivation of married prelates, 252; and married clergy, 253; married to Philip, 256; her negotiations with Pope Julius, 258; reception of Pole, 258, 259; her establishment of religious persecution, 264 sq.; refuses to spare Cranmer, 274; restores first-fruits, 275; dies, 278
Masses for the dead, esteemed by Cranmer in 1547, 206; impugned by Somerset when the chantries are to be plundered, 210
Massey, John, lay Dean of Christ's Church, 424
Matrimonial restrictions, Anglo-Saxon, 46
Matrimony, office for, in the several Prayer-books, 238
Meal Tub Plot, the, 418
Melancthon, the reformer, 139
Mellitus, Bp. of London, 23; becomes archbp., 28
Memorial of the Church of England, Dr. Drake's, 447
Mendicants, *see* Friars
Methodist Church guild at Oxford, the, 463; name applied to Wesley, Whitefield, and their followers, 466; history of the movement, 462-468; of the post-humous sects, 468 note
Mew, Bp. of Winchester, helps to suppress Monmouth's insurrection, 423
Millenary petition, the, 343
Milner, Rev., the evangelical, 470
Missal, the Latin, English of 1548, 216
Mixed Chalice, not ordered in Prayer-book of 1552, 237; prohibited by Purchas judgment, 485
Monasteries, numerous in Britain, 16; Saxon, 58; Anglo-Norman, 70; how utilised by the Pope, 58, 70; new varieties of, 74, 75; growing pretensions of, in 12th cent. 88, 89; supplanted by the uni-

Occasional.

versity system, 101; theory of life in, 105; Cromwell's scheme for spoiling, 168; pretexts, 169, 170; precedents, 170, 171; detailed account of proceedings, 171-176; consequences, 176-179
Monk, summons the Long Parliament, 461; declares for Charles, 402
Monks, new orders of, come in with the Normans, 74, 75, *see* "Monasteries" and Regulars
More, Hannah, Evangelical, 470; account of the Church, 471
More, Henry, Latitudinarian, 420
More, Sir Thomas, educational reformer, 148; succeeds Wolsey as Chancellor, 151; assailed by the Treasons Act, 157; cannot accept Royal Supremacy, 164; and is beheaded, 165; career of, 165, 166; account of the suppression of Wyclif's Bible, 123, 130 notes
Mortmain, Statute of, 100; suspended for twenty years under Mary, 262; modified under Anne, 444
Morton, Archbp. of York, Reformer, 134
Mountague, Dr., his writings, 361; censure of, in Commons, 366

V

Nag's Head fable, the, 304
Nelson, Robert, a Non-Juror, 437; eminent as a devout High Churchman, 437, 460; writes against Dr. Clarke, 456
Neville, Dean of Canterbury, 341
New Learning at Oxford, 134, 135; encouraged by Wolsey, 144; the partisans of, 181; how disparaged, 182
Newman, Cardinal, a Tractarian, 474; secedes to the Roman Communion, 476
Newton, Sir Isaac, a Cambridge representative before the High Commission, 429; inclined to Arianism, 455
Newton, Mr., of Olney, the Evangelical, 470
Nicæa, Council of, 8
Nicolson, Bp. of Carlisle, on the oath of allegiance, 437
Non-Jurors, the, 435-437; subsequent history of, 436 note
Norfolk, Duke of, opponent of Cranmer, 204; a privy councillor under Mary, 243
Northumberland, Duke of, his administration under Edward VI., 224; imprisons Bp. Tonstal, 227; persuades King Edward to appoint Lady Jane Grey his successor, 242; is imprisoned and executed, 243
Northumbria, conversion of, 28; Christianity restored in, by Oswald, 30
Norwich, diocese, hotbed of Puritanism, 331, 375, 413
Nowell's Catechism, 234, 312

VI

Oates, Titus, reveals a Romanist conspiracy, 417
Occasional conformity, account of, 445, 446; Act against, 446; repealed, 452

Ochin.

- Ochin, Bernard, a foreign Protestant and polygamist, 214
 Odo, Archbp. of Canterbury, 58; his measures of reform, 59
 Offa, King, founds the Lichfield archbishopric, pays Peter's Pence, 51, 52
 Oldcastle, Sir John, 128, 129
 Old Learning party, 180, 181; harassed under Edward VI., 221, 222; reaction in favour of, 243, 246, 257, 258
 Orders of clergy, the seven, 61
 Orders, Anglican, their validity admitted by Cardinal Pole, 263 note; their continuity, 280-285
 Ordinal of 1550, 218
 Ordinals, in the several Prayer-books, 238
 Origen, account of Christianity in Britain, 3
 Ornaments, church, desecration of, 211; ornaments rubric, and prescription, 294 and note
 Oseney, bishopric founded at, 178
 Osmund, Bp. of Sarum, 76
 Oswald's Law, 60
 Oswy, King of Northumbria, keeps British Easter, convinced by Wilfrid at Council of Whitby, 32; appointment of bishops, 34, 35
 Overall, Bp., author of Catechism on Sacraments, 340
 Oxford, harassed by James II., 429; Tractarian revival begins at, 474

P

- Paine, the sceptic, 458
 Paley, Dr. William, rector of Bishop-Wearmouth: his Evidences and Natural Theology, 459
 Pall, the, sent to Augustine by Gregory, 25; sent to Archbp. of Lichfield, 52; declared necessary for office of metropolitan, 50, 113; secured by Cranmer, 154
 Palladius in Ireland, 11
 Palmer, Sir William, a Tractarian, 474
 Pandulph, Papal nuncio, 90
 Papal pretensions at close of Saxon period, 63, 69; their growth, 113-118
 Pardoners, Papal, 110
 Paris, George von, a heretic, burnt, 229
 Parker, Bp. of Oxford, parasite of James II., 424 note; made President of Magdalene, Oxford, 429, 430
 Parker, Matthew, Archbp. of Canterbury, early history of, 287, 288 note; his religious opinions, 288; his consecration, 303 sq.; revises the Calendar, and helps to provide a lectionary, 305, 306; his share in the Bishops' Bible, 308, 309 note; issues the advertisements to suppress Puritanism, 315 sq.; summary of his work, 322, 323; his remains insulted by the Puritans, 323
 Parochial system existent before Theodore's primacy, 37, 45
 Passive obedience, *see* "Divine right."

Pole.

- Patrick, S., mission of, 11; his work not permanent, 12
 Patrick, Bp. of Chichester, a Latitudinarian, 420, 440
 Patronage, Papal usurpation of, 113-115
 Paul, S., supposed mission to Britain, 4
 Paul III., Pope, makes Fisher a cardinal, 165; excommunicates Henry, 179
 Paul IV., Pope, recalls Cardinal Pole, 277; insults Queen Elizabeth, 286
 Paulinus, missionary to Northumbria, 27, 28; his see at York—his work upset—becomes Bp. of Rochester, 29
 Peacham, Rev. E., victimised under James II., 359
 Pearce, Zachary, Bp. of Rochester, writes against Woolston; the Deist, 459
 Pearson, Bp. of Chester, 419
 Pechell, Dr., Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, punished by High Commission Court, 429
 Peckham, Archbp. of Canterbury, 96, 100
 Pecoock, Bp. of Chichester, an eclectic of Romanising tendencies—his career—punished for exalting the Pope, 130-132
 Pelagius, the British heretic, condemned at councils—influence in Britain, 12
 Penitential system, Anglo-Saxon, 46, 47
 Penn, the Quaker, patronised by James II., 422; urges the Fellows of Magdalene to submit, 429
 Penry, the Marprelate libeller, 334
 Percival, Mr., a Tractarian, 474
 Persecutions, religious, in 12th century, 87, 88; in 15th century, 127-132; under Henry VIII., 189-196, 198; under Edward VI., 222 sq.; under Mary, 263 sq.; under James I., 357; by the Puritans, 393 sq.; in the present reign, 482
 Perth, general assembly at, 355, 356
 Peter Martyr, a foreign Protestant, at Oxford, 214, 234
 Peters, Hugh, the Puritan, 400
 Peter's Pence, originates with Offa, 52; paid by William I., 73; subsequent history of, *ib.* note.
 Peterborough, bishopric founded at, 178
 Peto, friar, appointed legate, 277
 Petre, Father, in the Privy Council of James II., 424
 Philpot the reformer, imprisoned, 255
 Pierce, Bp. of Bath and Wells, imprisoned, 382, 383
 Piers Ploughman on Bishops *in partibus*, 104; on the Mendicants, 109; on abuses in Church, 118; his imitators, 118, 119
 Pilgrimage of Grace, 174, 175
 Pilgrimages, 50, 51, 110
 Pilkington, Bp. of Durham, 318
 Pisa, Council of, 133
 Pius IV., Pope, offers to sanction our Prayer-book, 319
 Pius V., Pope, his bull against Elizabeth, 282, 320
 Plan of Pacification, the Methodist, 468
 Pole, Reginald, denounces Henry VIII.—is made cardinal—his mother executed,

Poole.

- 198; is made legate to England, 245, 246; short account of, 245 note; returns to England, 257; absolves the nation, 258-261; and the clergy, 261; his concessions, 263; becomes priest and archbp., 275; forced to head the Marian persecution, 276; his legative commission revoked, 277; dies, 278
- Poole, Bp., refuses to help in Parker's consecration, 303
- Porteus, Bp. of London, an evangelical, 469; his work contrasted with Bp. Blomfield's, 471 note
- Poynt, Bp. of Winchester, an immoral ultra-Protestant, 213; his Catechism, 234
- Practical Catechism, Hammond's, 419
- Præmunire*, the statutes of, 117; Wolsey assailed by means of, 147; clergy unjustly menaced by, 147, 155 sq.; laity escape, 158; those of Henry VIII. abolished, 251; clergy ask to have explained, 261
- Prayer-book of 1549, 216; prepared by a committee of divines, 217; sanctioned by Act of Uniformity, *ib.*; satisfies nobody, 218; of 1552, 234; the Communion Office of, 235; never came into use, 236; abused by the foreign Protestants, 239; of 1559, 292 sq.; its informal revision at the Hampton Court Conference (1604), 346; use of, proscribed, 388; of 1662, account of its compilation, 410, 411; compared with the earlier Prayer-books, 236-238, 411 note
- Precisians, *see* Puritans
- Predestination controversy, the, 338 sq.
- Presbyterian, Hampton Court Conference (1604), 236 note, 346; Covenant cruelly enforced, 387; Directory and Classes, 388; system too orderly for the rebels, 388, 389; deputation to the Hague, 403; proposal to modify the autocratic episcopacy of modern times, 404, 405; James II. makes concessions to, 427; sect largely infected by Socinianism, 456
- Prideaux, Humphrey, Dean of Norwich, his Connection of Sacred and Pagan History, 449
- Priestly, Dr., the Socinian, confuted by Archd. Horsley, 456
- Primer, the King's, 200; other Primers, 201
- Privy Council Committee "regulates" the municipal corporations, 430; takes the place of the High Court of Delegates, 476, 481; Ritualists tried by, 482; decisions of, 484, 485
- Prophesyings, the, 325
- Protestant, the term applied to our Church, 342, 343, and note
- Protestants, foreign, enter England under Edward VI., 214; their influence on the Church, 214; their insolence, 214 note; their flight at Mary's accession, 247, 252
- Protestantism, its origin, 138; its principles, 139; its schismatic tendency, 140; its relation to the Reformation, 141; how

Reformation.

- treated by Henry VIII., 145, 182; its disorderly character, 191; some of its martyrs, 192, 193; Edward VI.'s reign more propitious to, 214; espoused by Northumberland, 224; reaction against, 223, 224, 246 sq.
- Provision, of benefices, 97; protested against, 103; of bishoprics under Martin V., 116
- Prynne the libeller, 371; compensated, 382
- Public Worship Regulation Act, 483
- Publicani, the, 86
- Pudens and Claudia, legend of, 5
- Purgatory, doctrine of, 61, 184
- Puritans: Hooper, the first Puritan confessor, 230, 231; position of the faction on the accession of Elizabeth, 280; their prejudices humoured, 283; object to the XXXIX Articles, 310; supported by Leicester, 313; often dissenters at heart, 314; Parker coerces them by means of the Advertisements, 315 sq.; encouraged by Grindal, 325; become sectarian, 328; are subjected to Whitgift's three tests, 332; issue the Marprelate libels, 334; draw up their millenary petition, 343; appear at the Hampton Court Conference, 345; are severely treated by Bancroft, 350; their "abridgment of the Lincoln ministers," 352; encouraged by Abbot, 357; their sabbatarianism hated by James I., 359; gain popularity because opposed to absolutism, 361, 363, 366; the Puritan libellers, punished by the Star Chamber, 371 sq.; their irreverent practices, 373-375; they try to enforce sabbatarianism, 377; they persecute the clergy, 382 sq., 400 sq.; and desecrate the churches, 395; Puritans at the Universities, 395, 396; they persecute the High Churchmen of the present reign, 482 sq.
- Pusey, Dr., a Tractarian, 474
- Q**
- Quakers, liberated by James II., 422
- Quarto-deciman observance of Easter, 17, 18
- Queen Anne's Bounty, institution of, 444
- Quia Emptores*, the, 100
- Quinquarticular Controversy, 359, 360
- R**
- Rabanus Maurus, opponent of Transubstantiation, 55
- Raikes, Robert, printer, introduces Sunday-schools, 470
- Ranters, the, 399
- Real Presence, doctrine of, distinct from Transubstantiation, 55, 56, 207, 254, 482, 485
- "*Reformatio Legum*," produced by Cranmer's committee, 239; never authorised, *ib.*; amount of, 239, 240
- Reformation, English, much needed, 134, 135; how affected by Protestantism, 141; disgraced by the leading men of Edward VI.'s reign, 207 sq.; and by sectarian ten-

Reformation.

dencies, 214; its mismanagement causes an insurrection, 223
 Reformation Parliament, 154 sq.
 "Reformed Liturgy," Baxter's, 408
 Reformers, in the 14th cent., 118 sq.; in the 15th, 134; in the 16th, 147
Regium Donum, the, 456, 457
 Regular clergy, conflict with secular, 57 sq.; Papal tools to weaken the national Church, 58, 70; oust the secular chapters from cathedrals, 74; growing pretensions of, in 12th century, 88, 89; resisted by Grosse-teste, 98, 99; weakened by use of the universities, 101; of little use as pastors, 104, 105; swept away under Henry VIII., 168-179; chapters of, at cathedrals, reorganised, 178; restored by Mary, 252, 253; by James II., 424, 425
 Regulation of the universities, 395
 Religious Tract Society, 470
 Renard, the Imperial Ambassador, 245
 Reservation of Benefices, 97; protested against, 103; of the English Primacy, 114; of Bishoprics, 115, 116
 Revision of Prayer-book in Low Church interests attempted, 440
 Reynolds, Bp. of Norwich, a Puritan delegate to the Hague, 403; and to the Savoy Conference, 407; made a bishop, 407
 Rich, Edmund, Archbp. of Canterbury, 98
 Richard, Archbp. of Canterbury, 86
 Richardson, Chief Justice, 377
 Ridley, preacher at Paul's Cross, 210; made Bp. of London, 226; illegally substitutes tables for altars, 226; his low view of the Holy Communion, 235; joins Lady Jane Grey's faction, and is imprisoned, 243; compelled to dispute at Oxford, 253, 254; is condemned, 255; and burnt, 270; biography of, 271
 Ridsdale v. Clifton, 485
 Ritualism in modern dissenting chapels, 475 note
 Ritualists, the, 482; persecution of, 482-485
 Rogers, the reformer, 255, 268
 Rolle, Richard, translates the Psalter, 123 note
 Romaine, Mr., the Evangelical, 470
 Roman Catholic Disabilities, 334, 417, 454, 479 note.
 Roman Encroachment, early, 54, 63, 64; growth of, 69, 70, 73, 79, 97; resisted under Edward I., 100, 101, 105; in bishoprics, 114, 115
 Rome, separation from, 154-161
 Root and Branch Bill, 386
 Rouse, Mr., a Puritan M. P., 369
 Rubric, the Black, 293
 Rye House Plot, the, 418

S

Sabbatarian Controversy, *see* Sunday question
 Sacheverell, Dr., his sermon, trial, sentence,

Sherlock.

and subsequent preferment, 448; causes the overthrow of the Whigs, 444, 449
 Sacramental test, the, 354
 "Saints' Everlasting Rest," Baxter's, 419
 Salter's Hall Controversy, the, 456
 Sampson, Dean, a Puritan, 319
 Sancroft, Archbp. of Canterbury (1677), ordered to abridge Coronation Service, 422; issues royal injunction prohibiting controversial preaching, 425; declines to act as a High Commissioner, 426; refuses to circulate the Declaration of Indulgence, 431; committed to the Tower, tried, and acquitted, 432; loyal to the last, 433; wishes William to be *custos regni*, 434; refuses the oath of allegiance, 435; his deprivation, 436
 Sanderson, Bp. of Lincoln, 407
 Sandys, Bp. of Worcester, 305; proposes to Erastianize the Church, 313
 Saravia, Adrian, his defence of Episcopacy, 336
 Sardica, Council of, 8
 Sarum, Use of, 76
 Savonarola, the reformer, 134
 Savoy Conference, the, appointment of, 407; Sheldon's management of, 408; proceedings in, 409, 410
 Sawtry, William, a Lollard martyr, 127
 Schism, the Romish, 320 note
 Schism Bill, the, 446; repealed, 452
 Scory, Bp. of Chichester, publishes Cranmer's manifesto without leave, 249
 Scotland swears fealty to Rome, 91 note; restoration of Episcopacy to, 354-356; canons for, drawn up by Charles I., 378; liturgy for it, 378
 Scott, Mr., the Evangelical, 470
 Seabury, Dr., consecrated Bp. of Connecticut, 467
 Sects, Puritan, during the interregnum, 399
 Seekers, 399
 Sees, Episcopal, plundered under Edward VI., 222, 227
 Selsey, Bishopric at, founded by Wilfrid, 40
 Sententiarii, the, 109
 Sequestered clergy, provision for families of, 394
 Seventy Years' Captivity, the, 103
 Shaftesbury's "Characteristics," 457
 Sharp, Archbp. of York, his sermon against Popery at his Church of St. Giles, 425; Compton declines to suspend him, 425; preferred under William III., 441
 Shaxton, Bp. of Salisbury, 194
 Sheldon, Archbp. of Canterbury, maintains Anglicanism during the interregnum, 401; made Bp. of London and the Savoy Conference meets at his house, 407; skillful conduct of the debate, 408; his primacy aids the revival of Anglicanism, 413; persuades the clergy to resign right of self-taxation, 414
 Sheppard v. Bennett, 485
 Sheffield, Dr., the Puritan, 371
 Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's, calculation of

Sherlock

number of dissenters in 1676, 413; denounces Romanism under James II., 425; writes the "Case of Resistance" as a Non-Juror—leaves the Non-Jurors and writes the "Case of Allegiance," 436
 Sherlock, Thomas, Bp. of London, author of the "Trial of the Four Witnesses," 459
 Short Parliament, the, 379, 380
 Shower, Sir Bartholomew, author of "Letter to a Convocation Man," 442
 Sibthorpe, Dr., preaches in behalf of Absolutism, 367
 Simeon, Mr., the Evangelical, 470
 Six Articles, the, repealed, 210
 Skinner, Bp. of Oxford, uses the Church services at Taunton, 394, 401
 Smalbroke, Bp. of Lichfield, writes against Woolston, the Deist, 459
 Smalridge, Bp. of Bristol, promotes the negotiations with Dr. Jablouski, 450
 Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, foundation of, 443
 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, its precursor in reign of Charles II., 419; its foundation, 443
 Socinianism, spread of, among the dissenters, 456
 Solemn League and Covenant, the, 378; accepted by Parliament and forced upon the country, 387; and clergy, 393
 Somerset, Duke of, becomes Lord Protector, 205; an ultra-Protestant, 205; plunders the Church, 205; demolishes churches in London, 206; confiscates the revenues of the Chantries, 210; is disgraced, 224; his heresy commission, 229
 Soto, Pedro de, Spanish ecclesiastic, 266
 South, Dr., 420
 Spanish ecclesiastics in England, 265; establish the Marian persecution, 266 sq.
 Spanish Match, the, of Mary's reign, 251, 256; of James I.'s reign, 360
 Sparke, Dr., a Puritan Delegate, 345
 Spires, Diet of, 138
 Spotswood consecrated Archbp. of Glasgow, 355
 Sprat, Bp. of Rochester, 424 note; one of the High Commission Court, 426; reads the declaration in Westminster Abbey, 431; leaves the Commission, 433
 Star Chamber Court, severities of, 370-372
 State connection, modern anomalies in, 479
 Statesmen, clerical, in 13th cent., 95, 104
 Stigand, Archbp., anoints Edgar Atheling, 62; is deposed as an irreconcilable, 62, 68, 71
 Stillingfleet, Bp. of Worcester (1689), a Latitudinarian, 420
 Stock, Mr., introduces Sunday-schools, 470
 Stokesley, Bp. of Durham, a leader of the old learning party, 181
 Stony Sabbath, the, 378
 Submission of the clergy, 158
 Sudbury, Archbp. of Canterbury, murdered, 122

Tonstal.

Sufferings of the clergy in the Puritan persecution, 393 sq.
 Sunday, the, question in Elizabeth's reign, 337, 338; in James I.'s reign, 344; under Charles I., 376
 Sunday Schools, origin of, 470; made subsidiary to the Anglican revival, 478
 Supplication of Beggars, the, 166
 "Supplication of Souls," Sir T. More's, 166
 Supremacy, Royal, Act of, 62, 73, 155; how accepted by Convocation, 156; its repeal, 157; under Elizabeth, 289
 Surplice riot, the, 475
 Sussex, conversion of, 40
 Swift, champion of ecclesiastical toriyism, 449; writes against Anthony Collins, 457
 Synods, desirable as a check to episcopal autocracy, 405 and note, 406, 477, 484 (see Autocracy)

T

Tanquelm, 87
 Tauler, the mystic, 126, 460
 Taxation of clergy apart from laity, 95, 96, 414
 Taylor, Jeremy, Bp. of Down and Connor, 419
 Taylor, reformer, Bp. of Lincoln, 253, 255
 Taylor, reformer, Dr. R., burnt, 268
 Taylor, William, Lollard martyr, 128
 Temporalities, Church, confiscated by Henry VIII., 168-179; and by the Government of Edward VI., 205 sq.; the laity averse to their restoration, 256, 257; the Pope allows their retention, 262
 Tenison, Archbp. of Canterbury, 442
 Tertullian, account of Christianity in Britain, 3
 Tests of Conformity, under Elizabeth, 322; those of Charles II., 417; modified, 452; repealed, 479
 Thadiocus, Archbp. of York, 14
 Theodore of Tarsus, Archbp. of Canterbury, sent from Rome, 34; deposes Chad, 35; breaks up the large dioceses, 36; supposed founder of the parochial system, 37; father of Anglo-Saxon literature, 38; and of our diocesan organisation, 37, 41; his independence of Rome, 39
 Theonas, Bp. of London, 14
 Thirleby, Bp. of Ely, 273; persuades Cranmer to recant, 274
 Thorpe, William, the Lollard martyr, 128
 Throgmorton, the Marprelate libeller, 334
 Tindal, Dr., the Deist, 458
 Tithes, 53
 Toland's "Christianity not mysterious," 457
 Toleration, growth of, 420, 437; and Bill of, under William III., 438.
 Tonstal, Bp. of Durham, a leader of the old learning party, 181; excluded from the Council, 205; his estates coveted by Northumberland, 227; is imprisoned, *ib.*

Tonsure.

- released, 243; refuses to help at Parker's consecration, 303
 Tonsure, British, 18
 Toplady, Mr., the Evangelical, 469
 Tract No. XC., 474
 Tractarian movement, 473 sq.
 Transubstantiation, origin of the dogma, 55; not accepted by Anglo-Saxon Church, 56; declared an article of faith in 13th century, 56; rejected by Wyclif, 124; sanctioned by ten Articles, 183; by the six Articles, 195; Cranmer confounds with trans-accentation, 221 and note; disowned by Cranmer at Oxford, 254; denounced by the imprisoned divines in 1554, 255
 Trask, the Puritan, 359
 Treasons Act, Henry VIII.'s, 165; repealed under Mary, 251
 Trelawney, Bp. of Bristol, one of the Seven Bishops, 431 note, 432
 Trialogue, Wyclif's, 122, 123
 Triers of candidates for the ministry, 388, 400
Trinoda necessitas, the, 43
 Turner, Dean, a Puritan, 319
 Turner, Bp. of Ely, one of the Seven Bishops, 431, 432; deprived as a Non-Juror, 435; heads the schism, 436 and note
 Tyndale, his Bible translation, 165, 166, 349; assailed in Sir T. More's "Dialogue," 166

U

- Udal, Nicholas, Marprelate libeller, 334
Unam Sanctam, the, 102
 Uniformity, Acts of, enforcing Prayer-book of 1549, 217; enforcing Prayer-book of 1552, 236; enforcing Prayer-book of 1559, 294; enforcing Prayer-book of 1662, 411
 Union Bill of William III., 439
 Unity of Church precedes Unity of State, 41
 Universities, friars at the, 108, 109; judgment on Henry VIII.'s divorce case wrung from, 152, 153; plundered under Edward VI., 222
 Urban II., Pope, 77
 Usher, Archbp. of Armagh, 384; his scheme for limiting episcopal autocracy by means of synods, 405 note.
 Usurping incumbents forced to resign, 411, 412
 "Utopia," Sir T. More's, 148

V

- Vanists, 399
 Venn, Rev., of Huddersfield, Evangelical, 469
 Venn, of Clapham, Evangelical, 470
 Vermigli, *alias* Peter Martyr, 214
 Vestment rubric in the several Prayer Books, 238
 Vicars, monastic, 105
 Villagarcia, Juan de, Spanish ecclesiastic, 366

Whitgift.

- Visitation of Monasteries, *see* Monasteries
 Visitation of the Sick, Office for, in the several Prayer-books, 238
 Vow in favour of Calvinism, the parliamentary, 369

W

- Wafer bread, injunctions and rubrics on, 237; ordered by Elizabeth, 302
 Wagstaffe, the Non-Juror, consecrated Bp. of Ipswich, 436 note; opinion of the bishops of the establishment, 452
 Wake, Archbp. of Canterbury, answers the "Letter to a Convocation Man," 442; corresponds with Bossuet, 454; receives letters from Du Pin as to union with the Gallican Church, 454
 Waldenses, the, 87 note, 88
 Wales, accepts Anglo-Saxon usages, 42
 Walker's "Sufferings of the Clergy," 393, 394
 Walker, Obadiah, the Romanist, 424
 Wall, William, Rev., his "History of Infant Baptism," 449
 Walton, Bp. of Chester, 407
 Warburton, Bp. of Gloucester, his "Divine Legation of Moses," 459
 Ward, delegate to Synod of Dort, 359
 Warham, Archbp. of York, 135, 148, 164
 Waterland, Dr., answers Dr. Clarke, defence of the Church's creed, 456
 Watson, Bp. of Llandaff, writes against Gibbon, 459
 Waynfleet, Bp. of Winchester, 171
 Wells, Dr., answers Dr. Clarke, 456
 Wentworth, Mr., his bills of reformation, 321
 Wesley, John, character, 462; work of, 462, 463; badly treated by the Church, 465; a sound Churchman, 465, 467; his mock consecration, 467; history of his followers, 468 note
 Westminster, council at, 82; made a bishopric by Henry VIII., 178; its abbey threatened with destruction by Somerset, 206; disputation at, in 1559, 296; Feckenham, last abbot of, 303
 Westminster Assembly, the, 387, 389
 Whiston, Dr. William, censured by Convocation, 445; account of, 455; writes against Anthony Collins, 457
 Whitaker, Dr., Calvinist, 340
 Whitby, Council of, 19, 31, 32
 White, Bp. of Peterborough, one of the Seven Bishops, 431, 432; deprived as a Non-Juror, 435; heads the schism, 436 and note
 Whitefield, George, a Methodist at Oxford, his talents, 463; his work, 464; severs from Wesley, 465; his followers become "seceders," 466; the "Evangelicals" of the same type as, 468
 Whitgift, Archbp. of Canterbury, suppresses Cartwright at Cambridge, 321; appointed to succeed Archbp. Grindal, 328; suppresses disorderly Puritanism, 331; his three tests, 332; his Twenty-four Articles,

Whiting.

- 333; at Hampton Court Conference, 345; the Church greatly indebted to him, 349, 350
- Whiting, Abbot, executed, 176
- Whittingham, translator of Genevan New Testament, 308 note; lay Dean of Durham, 318
- Wighard, selected to be Archbp. of Canterbury, 34
- Wightman, Edward, burnt for heresy, 357
- Wilberforce, Wm., Evangelical layman, 470
- Wild, Dr., his "funeral sermon of preaching," 399
- Wilfrid, at Council of Whitby, 32; consecrated abroad, 35; Chad appointed to his see in his absence, 35; Theodore reinstates Wilfrid, 35; but breaks up his diocese, 36; his appeals to Rome, 40; his mission to Sussex, 40; is reinstated at Hexham, 41; his services to literature, 39
- William I., condition of Church at accession of, 66-68; his ecclesiastical laws, 72; refuses homage to the Pope, 73; compared with Henry VIII., 73
- William II., despoils the Church, 77; conflicts with Anselm, 77, 78
- Williams, Dean, made Lord-Keeper and Bp. of Lincoln, 361; disgraced and imprisoned, 364; invited to impeach Laud, 382
- Williams, Isaac, a Tractarian, 474
- Williams v. Bp. of Salisbury, 484
- Wilson v. Fendale, 484
- Winchelsey, Archbp. of Canterbury, 102
- Winchester, Synod at, forbids clerical marriages, 76
- Winchester, Marquis of, abets the Marian persecution, 267
- Winifrid, see Boniface
- Wolsey, Cardinal, under-estimated, 142; his rise, 143; his administration in Church and State, 137, 143-146; discredibly implicated in the Divorce

Zwingle.

- intrigue, 146; his downfall, 147; his religious toleration, 191, 192
- Wood's account of the Puritan students at Oxford, 396
- Woodard, Canon, his middle-class schools, 478
- Woolston, his "Six Discourses on the Miracles," 457, 458; the first Deist confessor, 458
- Worcester House Declaration, rejected by the Commons, 406
- Worms, Diet of, 138
- Wotton, Dr., answers Lord Shaftesbury, 459
- Wren, Sir Christopher, his churches in London, 449
- Wren, Bp. of Ely, 382; imprisoned, 383
- Wriothesley, Lord Chancellor, excluded from the Council, 205
- Wykeham, William of, Bp. of Winchester, 120
- Wyclif, John, reformer, Master of Balliol, 119; inveighs against Prelate-Statesmen—supported by Duke of Lancaster—his mission to Bruges, 120; his attacks on the Pope—summoned to St. Paul's—denounced by the Pope, 121; unwittingly encourages socialism, 122; his disgrace and retirement, 122; his religious system, 123, 124; how dangerous, 125, 126; his Bible suppressed, 123, 129, 130 and
- X
- Ximenes, Cardinal, the reformer, 134
- Y
- York, Archbishopric of, 29, 37 note, 39, 75 and note
- Z
- Zwingle, the reformer, 139



2830

91020

Jennings, Arthur C.

2830

J441

Ecclesia Anglicana

--	--	--	--	--	--

191020

2830

J441

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary

175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others. You are responsible for them.

